MADRID

NEW GUIDES TO OLD MASTERS

JOHN C. VAN DYKE

GIFT OF
NOAH BUTKIN

NEW GUIDES TO OLD MASTERS

By John C. Van Dyke

		PRICE
I.	*London*—National Gallery, Wallace Collection. With a General Introduction and Bibliography for the Series	*net* $1.00
II.	*Paris*—Louvre	*net* .75
III.	*Amsterdam*—Rijks Museum *The Hague*—Royal Gallery *Haarlem*—Hals Museum } bound together .	*net* .75
IV.	*Brussels*—Royal Museum *Antwerp*—Royal Museum } bound together .	*net* .75
V.	*Munich*—Old Pinacothek *Frankfort*—Staedel Institute *Cassel*—Royal Gallery } bound together .	*net* 1.00
VI.	*Berlin*—Kaiser-Friedrich Museum *Dresden*—Royal Gallery } bound together .	*net* 1.00
VII.	*Vienna*—Imperial Gallery *Budapest*—Museum of Fine Arts } bound together .	*net* 1.00
VIII.	*St. Petersburg*—Hermitage	*net* .75
IX.	*Venice*—Academy *Milan*—Brera, Poldi-Pezzoli } bound together .	*net* 1.00
X.	*Florence*—Uffizi, Pitti, Academy	*In Press*
XI.	*Rome*—Vatican, Borghese Gallery	*In Press*
XII.	*Madrid*—Prado	*net* .75

THE PRADO

Photograph by Anderson, Rome

VELASQUEZ: LAS MENINAS
The Prado, Madrid

NEW GUIDES TO OLD MASTERS

MADRID

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE PRADO

BY

JOHN C. VAN DYKE

AUTHOR OF "ART FOR ART'S SAKE," "THE MEANING OF PICTURES," "HISTORY OF PAINTING," "OLD DUTCH AND FLEMISH MASTERS," ETC.

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1914

COPYRIGHT, 1914, BY
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Published June, 1914

PREFACE TO THE SERIES

THERE are numerous guide-books, catalogues, and histories of the European galleries, but, unfortunately for the gallery visitor, they are either wholly descriptive of obvious facts or they are historical and archæological about matters somewhat removed from art itself. In them the gist of a picture—its value or meaning as art—is usually passed over in silence. It seems that there is some need of a guide that shall say less about the well-worn saints and more about the man behind the paint-brush; that shall deal with pictures from the painter's point of view, rather than that of the ecclesiastic, the archæologist, or the literary romancer; that shall have some sense of proportion in the selection and criticism of pictures; that shall have a critical basis for discrimination between the good and the bad; and that shall, for these reasons, be of service to the travelling public as well as to the art student.

This series of guide-books attempts to meet these requirements. They deal only with the so-called "old masters." When the old masters came upon the scene, flourished, and ceased to exist may be determined by their spirit as well as by their dates. In Italy the tradition of the craft had been established before Giotto and was carried on by Benozzo, Botti-

celli, Raphael, Titian, Tintoretto, even down to Tiepolo in the eighteenth century. But the late men, the men of the Decadence, are not mentioned here because of their exaggerated sentiment, their inferior workmanship—in short, the decay of the tradition of the craft. In France the fifteenth-century primitives are considered, and also the sixteenth-century men, including Claude and Poussin; but the work of the Rigauds, Mignards, Coypels, Watteaus, and Bouchers seems of a distinctly modern spirit and does not belong here. This is equally true of all English painting from Hogarth to the present time. In Spain we stop with the School of Velasquez, in Germany and the Low Countries with the seventeenth-century men. The modern painters, down to the present day, so far as they are found in the public galleries of Europe, will perhaps form a separate guide-book, which by its very limitation to modern painting can be better treated by itself.

Only the best pictures among the old masters are chosen for comment. This does not mean, however, that only the great masterpieces have been considered. There are, for instance, notes upon some three hundred pictures in the Venice Academy, upon five hundred in the Uffizi Gallery, and some six hundred in the Louvre or the National Gallery, London. Other galleries are treated in the same proportion. But it has not been thought worth while to delve deeply into the paternity of pictures by third-rate primitives or

to give space to mediocre or ruined examples by even celebrated painters. The merits that now exist in a canvas, and can be seen by any intelligent observer, are the features insisted upon herein.

In giving the relative rank of pictures, a system of starring has been followed.

Mention without a star indicates a picture of merit, otherwise it would not have been selected from the given collection at all.

One star (*) means a picture of more than average importance, whether it be by a great or by a mediocre painter.

Two stars (**) indicates a work of high rank as art, quite regardless of its painter's name, and may be given to a picture attributed to a school or by a painter unknown.

Three stars (***) signifies a great masterpiece.

The length of each note and its general tenor will in most cases suggest the relative importance of the picture.

Catalogues of the galleries should be used in connection with these guide-books, for they contain much information not repeated here. The gallery catalogues are usually arranged alphabetically under the painters' names, although there are some of them that make reference by school, or room, or number, according to the hanging of the pictures in the gallery. But the place where the picture may be hung is constantly shifting; its number, too, may be subject to alteration with each new edition of the catalogue; but its painter's

name is perhaps less liable to change. An arrangement, therefore, by the painters' names placed alphabetically has been necessarily adopted in these guide-books. Usually the prefixes "de," "di," "van," and "von" have been disregarded in the arrangement of the names. And usually, also, the more familiar name of the artist is used—that is, Botticelli, not Filipepi; Correggio, not Allegri; Tintoretto, not Robusti. In practical use the student can ascertain from the picture-frame the name of the painter and turn to it alphabetically in this guide-book. In case the name has been recently changed, he can take the number from the frame and, by turning to the numerical index at the end of each volume, can ascertain the former name and thus the alphabetical place of the note about that particular picture.

The picture appears under the name or attribution given in the catalogue. If there is no catalogue, then the name on the frame is taken. But that does not necessarily mean that the name or attribution is accepted in the notes. Differences of view are given very frequently. It is important that we should know the painter of the picture before us. The question of attribution is very much in the air to-day, and considerable space is devoted to it not only in the General Introduction but in the notes themselves. Occasionally, however, the whole question of authorship is passed over in favour of the beauty of the picture itself. It is always the art of the picture we are seeking, more than its name, or pedigree, or commercial value.

Conciseness herein has been a necessity. These notes are suggestions for study or thought rather than complete statements about the pictures. Even the matter of an attribution is often dismissed in a sentence though it may have been thought over for weeks. If the student would go to the bottom of things he must read further and do some investigating on his own account. The lives of the painters, the history of the schools, the opinions of the connoisseurs may be read elsewhere. A bibliography, in the London volume, will suggest the best among the available books in both history and criticism.

The proper test of a guide-book is its use. These notes were written in the galleries and before the pictures. I have not trusted my memory about them, nor shall I trust the memory of that man who, from his easy chair, declares he knows the pictures by heart. The opinions and conclusions herein have not been lightly arrived at. Indeed, they are the result of more than thirty years' study of the European galleries. That they are often diametrically opposed to current views and beliefs should not be cause for dismissing them from consideration. Examine the pictures, guide-book in hand. That is the test to which I submit and which I exact.

Yet with this insistence made, one must still feel apologetic or at least sceptical about results. However accurate one would be as to fact, it is obviously impossible to handle so many titles, names, and numbers

without an occasional failure of the eye or a slip of the pen; and however frankly fair in criticism one may fancy himself, it is again impossible to formulate judgments on, say, ten thousand pictures without here and there committing blunders. These difficulties may be obviated in future editions. If opinions herein are found to be wrong, they will be edited out of the work just as quickly as errors of fact. The reach is toward a reliable guide though the grasp may fall short of full attainment.

It remains to be said that I am indebted to Mr. and Mrs. George B. McClellan for helpful suggestions regarding this series, and to Mr. Sydney Philip Noe not only for good counsel but for practical assistance in copying manuscript and reading proof.

John C. Van Dyke.

Rutgers College, 1914.

THE PRADO

NOTE ON THE PRADO

THE pictures of the Prado represent the collections of the kings of Spain. The art treasures of Charles V, Philip II, Philip IV, Philip V are incorporated in the present gallery. Ferdinand VII made the final combination by bringing together the pictures from all the royal palaces except the Escorial. In 1840 a notable addition of Spanish and Flemish works taken from convents was brought to the Prado. Since then the accumulations have been sporadic and limited. Perhaps the gallery can get on without further acquisitions. It already holds twenty-five hundred pictures and has a wide-spread reputation in consequence thereof.

Seen from America, or even from London, Paris, or Berlin, the gallery at Madrid takes on a roseate hue and looms skyward like a mirage. It is the greatest This and the most wonderful That of all the European galleries. But after one visits Madrid and spends several weeks in the gallery some of his illusions are dispelled. It is, of course, the one place in the world where one can study Velasquez in his various manners. There are forty-six of his pictures here, including many portraits, many equestrian figures, many compositions

of which Las Meninas, the Tapestry Weavers, the Surrender of Breda are the most important. The gallery is justly famous for its examples of Velasquez. There are also many Murillos which do not increase one's admiration for that painter, many fine Riberas, a large number of excellent Il Grecos, and rooms full of Goyas. Beside this there is effective representation of the early Spaniards such as one finds nowhere else. The value of the Prado in the study of Spanish art can hardly be overstated.

As for the Italian Schools, they are inadequately represented. There are many pictures ascribed to Titian, Tintoretto, Paolo Veronese, Raphael—some of them not genuine and others merely pictures of the schools—but by the Florentines, Umbrians, Ferrarese, Milanese there are very few. One misses Botticelli, Filippino, Ghirlandajo, Benozzo, Dossi, Tura, Solario, Antonello, Signorelli, Perugino, Pinturicchio, and a dozen others. The German and Dutch Schools are again wanting in adequate representation. There is one supposed Rembrandt, a charming Dürer, a questionable Holbein; but Terborch, Vermeer, De Hooch, with the pupils of Rembrandt, are not seen. Some of the least important of the little Netherlanders—the lesser Brueghels, for instance—have scores of pictures filling whole rooms in the gallery; but the blanks and gaps in the list of the greater men are astonishing. On the other hand, there are a few notable pictures by the early Flemings and by Rubens some sixty-five pictures—most of them

school pieces. There are only two or three clean pieces of painting by Rubens's own hand in the entire gathering.

Many of the large pictures in the gallery, especially those by Rubens and Titian, are in bad condition, as the result of either the fire of 1734 or subsequent repainting. There has been savage repainting upon many of these Prado pictures. They have not been well taken care of in the past. Nor are they well arranged or rightly hung at the present time. The building, as a place to hang pictures, has few desirable features and many shortcomings. The rooms are not sufficiently lighted save on the top floor. Strangely enough, this top floor with its good light is given over to third-rate pictures which might as well be placed in the storeroom, while down in the basement, in rooms fitted only for the keeping of vegetables, in the dark where no one can see them, are examples of the fine work of Van der Weyden, Memling, the Master of Flémalle, Patinir, Bosch—in some respects the most precious, certainly the most delicate, pictures in the gallery.

The arrangement on the wall is almost everywhere arbitrary. All the portraits, for instance, of all the schools are hung together, as though the interest in them was wholly iconographic and not æsthetic or pictorial. Velasquez, Goya, and others are in rooms by themselves, while the earlier Spaniards are distributed about as whim or occasion seems to demand. Titian and Rubens occupy the long gallery, but for

the rest of the Italians and Flemings you find them where and how you can. The catalogue (in Spanish) is of little help in locating the pictures. It is descriptive and not always historically accurate. Its attribution of the pictures leaves something to be desired.

The student should go to the Escorial (one hour from Madrid) for the few fine examples of the Italians and Flemings to be seen there. Toledo is a short day excursion from Madrid and one finds there many portraits by Il Greco. The Madrid churches contain nothing of importance, but the modern pictures in the Academy of San Fernando should be seen.

THE PRADO, MADRID

15. * **Angelico, Fra.** ***Annunciation.*** A large easel picture for Fra Angelico—perhaps too large for the rather attenuated sentiment it carries with it but it is beautiful, nevertheless. As a composition it does not hold together very well and the lighting is, of course, arbitrary. The angel is resplendent in gold and the garden in flowers. The predella below is charming in its small panels of colour. Notice that the second panel (The Visitation) is the direct reverse in light of the large picture above it. The landscape is here lighter than the porch, whereas in the picture above the porch and interior are lighter than the landscape. Another version in the Chiesa del Gesù, Cortona.

20. **Basaiti, Marco.** ***Christ Giving the Keys to Peter.*** This picture was formerly attributed to Marconi and then to Catena. The latter is, perhaps, a nearer guess than Basaiti. It has been cleaned and retouched and now has a washed-out, flattened look about it. The heads of the women at the upper left are interesting. The blue of the robe of Christ seems violent.

45. **Bassano, Leandro.** ***Portrait of an Unknown Man.*** A rather fine characterisation of a fat dignitary of some importance, perhaps, in his day and generation. The forehead is well done as also the eyes, nose, mouth, and hands. The fingers are like the work of Bassano. Formerly given to Titian.

50. * **Bellini, Giovanni.** ***The Virgin with St. Ursula and the Magdalen.*** This is a variation of the picture in the Venice Academy (No. 613), the St. Ursula showing here in place of the Magdalen there. It is done with almost as much charm and beauty as the Venetian picture. The types are lovely, especially the Madonna with her round, wondering eyes and her slight mouth. There is much nobility of feeling in the picture and much of naïve beauty, especially in the shy St. Ursula at the right. The colour is excellent though the background has darkened, and the green curtain back of the Madonna has deepened almost to the point of disappearance. Hurt by repainting.

610–618 **Berruguete, Pedro.** ***Scenes from the Lives of S. Domenico, et al.*** There are half a dozen or more of these pictures attributed to Pedro Berruguete, taken from the convent of S. Tomas at Avila, that have much decorative beauty. They are hard in drawing but interesting in colour and composition. Little is known about the man. He was an early Spaniard, dying after 1504, and may have been influenced by the Bellini or even Carpaccio.

1361. * **Bles, Herri met de.** ***Adoration of Kings.*** An excellent triptych and much better done than the pseudo-Bles in the Munich Gallery (No. 146) or any of the Antwerp pictures attributed to Bles. There is a good deal of material in each panel, after the fashion of Bles, but it is well held together and without spottiness in the lights. The architecture is ornate, the figures and costumes even more so. The whole triptych is a maze of fine goldsmith-like work. What beautiful robes in the central panel! What queenly women in the

Queen of Sheba panel at the right! The Bles owl sign is in the central panel, high up on the architecture, but it means little. The picture came from the Escorial, where it passed as a Lucas van Leyden. In good condition but in a bad frame.

2048. * **Bosch, Jerome.** ***Adoration of Kings.*** An excellent Bosch, it being less fantastic in conception and less spotty in small objects than his average work. The landscape, with its small figures, its distant city and sky, is wonderfully fine, and some of the figures in the foreground are not only noble in pose but superb in colour. Notice the black king in white in the centre panel, or the Madonna, or the St. Peter in the left wing. What beautiful colour and what excellent flat painting!

2053. ——***Creation.*** The picture is handsome in the figure of the Creator with the coral-red robe, but the rest of it is rather spotty in colour and too littered up with small objects. It is, however, superior to some of the other Boschs here, No. 2048 excepted. Nothing at the Prado quite reaches up to the fine examples of this painter in the Salles Capitulares at the Escorial.

1430. **Brueghel the Elder, Jan (Velvet).** ***Landscape.*** This and several other small landscapes (Nos. 1427, 1433, 1435, 1436) are decidedly good. There is a roomful of Brueghels here at the Prado, variously assigned and confused with one another, but if the student has well in mind the different styles of the four or more Brueghels he will have little difficulty in this collection. See the notes on the Brueghels at Antwerp and Vienna.

627. **Cano, Alonzo.** ***The Virgin Adoring the Child.*** There is something of Murillo in it without being

so sweet and sugary as Murillo usually appears. The colour is attractive and the landscape is more than good. It is hurt by repainting and cleaning, but still has some largeness and dignity about it.

629. ——*The Dead Christ.* A little weak in sentiment and uncertain in the drawing. The upholding angel is much frailer than a related subject in the Wallace Collection (No. 15) put down to Cano. In colour and in the wings of the angel there is a reminder of the Domenico Feti in the Berlin Gallery (No. 380B).

646. **Carreño de Miranda, Juan.** ***Portrait of a Girl in Red.*** A dwarf-like monstrosity in a blaze of red that is rather good. It is in the style of Velasquez but heavy and without his strength or delicacy of touch.

645. ——***Portrait of Potemkin.*** It has bulk and body to it though not done with the certainty of a Velasquez by any means. The dress is gorgeous.

642. ——***Portrait of Charles II.*** This is somewhat like the portrait in the Berlin Gallery (No. 407). Just which is the original would be difficult to establish. Both of them may have been worked up from the sketchy No. 648. Carreño was not such a genius of the brush that his style was very distinct from others of the school.

648. ——***Portrait of Charles II.*** A bust portrait that is too soft in the modelling and too smooth in the surfaces. It may be the original from which Nos. 642 and (at Berlin) No. 407 were constructed.

1461. ** **Christus, Peter.** ***Triptych.*** There are four panels of this so-called triptych showing the Annunciation, the Visitation, the Nativity, and the

Adoration. All the panels are surrounded by architectural framings, with sculptural reliefs executed with much truth and beauty. These framings are better done than in the Van der Weyden altar-pieces in the Berlin Gallery. The Annunciation with its set-in of the room and the figures is delightful. The colour and light of it are quite above reproach. And what could be finer than the robe of the angel, or the beautiful Madonna, or the bits of still-life, or the red robe, or the cushions at the back! The Visitation is simpler but with excellent colour in the figures, and a wonderful landscape. The hands are somewhat injured. The Nativity has suffered more than the other panels from retouching, especially in the Child, the Joseph, the kneeling angel, and the architecture at the back. The landscape is less interesting than in the Visitation. The fourth panel, the Adoration, is the richest of all in robes, jewels, and colouring. The splendour of it is amazing. Look at the jewelled collar and hat of the kneeling king, the fur-lined robe of the king back of him, the fine drawing of the faces and hands, the beautiful landscape with the castle, and the distant blue fields. This panel seems in excellent condition. The whole work is a masterpiece in skill and has good sentiment about it. It is put down to Christus and seems to agree in a vague way with certain pictures at Brussels and elsewhere, attributed to him; but the fact remains that there is little known about Christus in spite of persistent attributions to him. The catalogue admits that the authenticity of this Christus is questionable.

2254. **Claude Lorraine.** ***Port of Ostia.*** There are in this gallery half a dozen Claudes, of which No.

2254 or No. 2253 is, perhaps, the best. They are effective in composition and light, and, though to-day they seem a little theatrical, they are, nevertheless, notable works.

2259. ——***Landscape.*** The effect of the centre of light surrounded by darks is forced and not at all true to nature, but it has strength to it. The picture seems broader and different in handling from what one usually associates with Claude. He was a careful, somewhat timid person with the brush, as a rule.

1140. **Coello, Alonzo Sanchez.** ***Anne of Austria.*** An interesting head that has been cut down or cut out of some larger picture. It is well done.

1136. ——***Prince Charles.*** Done in a style that reached earlier development in Antonio Moro. It is not the best style of portraiture but is effective and measurably imposing. The high lights are overaccented, and the figure comes forward out of the frame. See also No. 1137 in a similar vein.

1144. ——***Marriage of St. Catherine.*** It seems to have been conceived after the manner rather than in the style of Correggio and as a result is merely pretty.

111. **Correggio, Antonio Allegri da.** ***Noli me Tangere.*** The picture is genuine enough but is not in good condition. The flesh-notes have been injured and there is an airless feeling about the sky that could probably be explained by the restorer's story. The attitude of the Christ is a little too dramatic, that of the Magdalen right enough. A graceful picture in colour, and the trees of the middle distance are suggestive of depth and shadow; but if one accepted this picture and No. 112 as

wholly representative of Correggio he would be greatly misled. They show none of his strength, and Correggio had strength as well as grace. Those who have studied him at Parma know that the pretty faces of women and children were not his whole artistic equipment.

112. ——***Madonna, Child, and St. John.*** Somewhat too pretty in the faces and possibly ultra-graceful in the lean and bend of the figures. The little St. John is a sturdy figure, the colour is good, and the landscape excellent. Notice the distant view with its slight touch of mystery.

2078. **Dou, Gerard.** ***A Hermit.*** To be compared with the so-called Rembrandt of the same subject in the Louvre (No. 2541A) to establish Dou as the possible painter of the Louvre picture.

2179. ** **Dürer, Albrecht.** ***Portrait of the Painter.*** Excellent in every way—except in its hanging upon the wall, which is atrocious. It is a marvel of exact drawing and really wonderful in its delicacy and effectiveness of touch. The characterisation of the youthful Dürer is superbly serious for all its dandified look. In pure pictorial charm he never went beyond this little portrait of himself. What a fine landscape through the window! Nothing could be more lovely as a glimpse of nature and nothing could be truer as a study of mountain forms. This is one of the gems of the gallery and, thank Heaven! not ruined by scrubbing or repainting. Some there are who doubt its authenticity, but, no matter whether it be original, copy, or even forgery, it is a fine portrait in any event. The work, however, is an original Dürer. A copy is in the Uffizi at Florence.

2180. * ——***Portrait of an Unknown Man.*** Not so certainly by Dürer and yet, perhaps, nearer to him than any other painter one can think of. It is a very good portrait both in its insight and characterisation and in its technique. A resolute personality, supposed to be that of Hans Imhof.

2177 } 2178 } * ——***Adam and Eve.*** The Eve is the more elaborate and the more posed of the two, but the Adam is the finer figure. The latter is a beautiful piece of drawing, though Dürer was not quite happy in his subject and handled it awkwardly and with difficulty. In such details as the hands and feet he is, of course, almost perfect. The surface has been hurt by repainting. The Eve seems in better condition, though a close study might disclose the fact that it, too, has been injured. Both are upon wood and signed—the Eve prominently in a cartel. Good copies in the Pitti, Florence (Nos. 1, 20).

1473. **Dyck, Anthony van.** ***St. Jerome.*** It is possibly the painter's first attempt at the St. Jerome in the Dresden Gallery, though this is somewhat different from that. It does not strike one as being an inspired work though good enough in its modelling.

1475. ——***Pietà.*** This picture is similar to the one in the Antwerp Museum, but different in size. It is fairly well drawn and held together. The flesh is blackish from under-basing. The handling seems pure, especially in the Magdalen.

1477. * ——***The Betrayal of Christ.*** A really fine Van Dyck, especially in the grouping, the push-up and crowd of the figures toward the central figure of Christ, and in its intense dramatic quality. The light is arbitrary studio light with a conventional

dark ground—there apparently being no light from the torch except as seen reflected from the leaves above. Still, the effect of a night scene is not badly given. The colouring is hot in the flesh and robes with the cool blue a little out of key. The drawing is very good. The whole work shows Van Dyck in his early style following Rubens. It is in rather bad condition.

1474. * ——***The Crowning with Thorns.*** The figure of Christ is hectic in the flesh but not wanting in brilliancy. It is an excellent figure. The picture is not, however, marked by any fine colour quality. The blues are all at the left and the warm colours are all at the right. The painting, especially in the armour, the hair, the flesh, seems very well done. The dog may not have been done by Van Dyck, but in any event the work upon him is careless work. In the painter's early style following Rubens.

1478. ——***St. Francis.*** Done with skill though now blackish in colour and somewhat repainted in the angel and elsewhere. The picture is pieced out at the top. Another version at Vienna (No. 1036).

1488. ——***Portrait of an Unknown Man.*** A common enough portrait with as many doubts about the Van Dyck part of it as about the identity of the sitter.

1483. ——***Portrait of the Princess of Orange, Amalia de Solms.*** The same sitter appears again in the portrait, No. 700, at the Brera, Milan. This Madrid portrait is badly cleaned in both hands and face with the flush in the face suggestive of the restorer.

1486. ——***Portrait of Count Bergh.*** It is a little formal in the pose. The armour is well painted and the head is well enough drawn, but the picture does not warrant the high praise that has been given it by some critics. Van Dyck in his best work is almost above praise, but his output was very uneven and much of it represents merely shop work.

1480. ——***Don Ferdinand of Austria.*** The colour is fairly good, but the portrait is too pretty in the face, hair, and dress, too weak in the characterisation.

1493. ——***The Marquise de Leganés.*** A picture of Van Dyck's Genoese period, imposing in dress, with a mannered attitude and hands that are of Van Dyck studio manufacture. Truth to fact probably compelled the disagreeable expression of the face. The background is blackish, and the line that cuts the canvas in two is disturbing. The portrait is not satisfactory.

1481. * ——***The Countess of Oxford.*** The left arm has been cleaned until the modelling has been destroyed, and the right hand looks as though it had been dipped in red paint, but the head is still satisfactory. There is a loftiness of attitude about the figure characteristic of Van Dyck, something imitated by many followers, but always an attractive feature of the Van Dyck portraits. This is not a great portrait by any means but excellent by contrast with some others here attributed to Van Dyck.

1479. ** ——***Portrait of David Ryckaert.*** It is painted on wood, and parts of it show the original surface with the strokes of the brush as the painter left them.

The sitter is a fine type and presented in both a manly and a picturesque way. How well the forehead, eyes, nose, moustache, and beard are done! And what very good colour! Van Dyck was not always so happy in his work. He was much given to doing the official canvas—the pot-boiler—but occasionally he broke forth with such a portrait as this, showing that he could if he would paint superbly. He was essentially a portrait-painter, and in the presence of such a portrait as this one regrets that he ever wasted time and energy on classical or religious themes.

1487. ——***Portrait of a Musician.*** It can hardly be questioned that it is a Van Dyck, for it has many indications of his workmanship, but it is far from being a distinguished product of his brush. How badly it is placed on the canvas, as though carelessly considered!

1489. ——***Van Dyck and the Count of Bristol.*** It is not well placed on the canvas, nor is it well painted. Probably never more than an unsuccessful experiment whoever did it. It has the look of a pupil's tribute to his master.

1510. **Eyck, Hubert van.** ***Christ, the Virgin, and St. John.*** This picture certainly has a Van Eyck look about it, suggesting as it does the chief figures in the St. Bavon altar-piece though it seems larger in scale and broader in handling than the original work. The minuteness of the detail in the jewels seems relaxed when it comes to the heads and faces. They are carefully drawn in the nose, brows, and eyes, but are remarkable in their largeness of vision for the time of the Van Eycks. Notice the hands, the hair, and the shadow masses about the

heads. The Madonna with her fair hair, crown, and jewelled robe is very good. A little angel with bird wings is pushing out of a circular window at the top. The picture is something of a puzzle. Modern criticism ignores it or dismisses it as a sixteenth-century version of the chief figures in the St. Bavon altar-piece, but wrangles extensively about a poor copy of Jan Van Eyck (No. 1511) which is not worth quarrelling over. This No. 1510 is a good picture no matter if it be a mere reconstruction. In workmanship it is vastly superior to No. 1511 and quite worthy of the later Flemish traditions.

1511. **Eyck, Jan van.** ***Triumph of the Church.*** A panel of interest and curiosity in art history. The composition, types, costumes, colours, architecture all echo the Van Eycks at second hand, as seen in Christus, but the execution is another matter. The drawing is hard, the outlines severe, the hair a little coarse, the grass too flat and wanting in shadow relief, the jewel work and architecture too crude, the Madonna too wooden in the head and neck, the hands too ill drawn. The Van Eycks could not have done it. It is probably some poor copy of a lost Van Eyck or Christus. Apparently two hands have worked upon it. The larger figures at the bottom are better in execution than the smaller ones in the middle or at the top. Notice how flat the figures and that the picture is wanting in the third dimension—depth.

1915. **Flemish School (15th Century).** ***Annunciation.*** A picture with some beauty of colour and good architecture but a little coarse in type, sentiment, and drawing. There have been many guesses at

its authorship, so it may do no harm to add still another, to the effect that it came from the workshop of the so-called Master of Flémalle, now more or less recognised as identical with Robert Campin.

1936. ——***Madonna and Child.*** A dark picture that has merit. It is the work of a northern painter influenced by Italy.

1930. ——***Madonna and Child.*** A somewhat prettified Madonna probably painted by Gossart, as Mündler suggested a long time ago. It is smooth and mannered but not wanting in charm.

1932. ——***Madonna, Child, and St. John.*** It lacks in force and has every appearance of being a sweetened following of Quentin Metsys.

1920. ——***Madonna and Child.*** The standing figure is short and heavy. There is a look of the School of the Master of Flémalle about the Madonna. The picture was formerly ascribed to Lucas van Leyden, and at one time thought to be a copy after a picture by the Van Eycks. See the note in the catalogue.

1921. ——***Madonna and Child.*** A work of some originality and still possessing considerable charm though in bad condition. Said to recall the manner of Christus.

1933. ——***Madonna and St. Anne.*** This panel and the Nos. 1927, 1928, 1929, 1935 originally formed a retable, but are now (1912) ruthlessly, recklessly, and unnecessarily distributed to the four corners of the room instead of being brought together where they might be studied, compared, and looked at for singleness of effect. The panels are by some unknown Flemish painter, and not great work, but

such merit as they may have possessed is now harmed by the unhappy distribution.

143. **Francia, Giacomo.** ***St. Margaret with Saints.*** The picture is not one to grow enthusiastic over. It is evidently something that came out of the workshop of Francesco Francia. See the catalogue note upon it.

705–710 **Gallegos, Fernando.** ***Scenes from Life of John Baptist.*** A half dozen small pictures showing an early Spanish painter working under Flemish influence, presumably that of Bouts.

2219 2220 **German School.** ***Harmony and The Three Ages.*** Two panels (not certainly by the same hand) that have some charm of form and colour—the No. 2219 more than the other. The names of half a dozen painters have been suggested as the author of their being. The note in the catalogue suggests the disagreement of the doctors in the case.

69. **Girolamo da Carpi.** ***Portrait of a Man.*** The badly drawn left hand is too prominent but otherwise the portrait is very good. It was formerly attributed to Allori.

1536. **Gossart, Jan (Mabuse).** ***Madonna and Child.*** There is interesting if rather ornate architecture at the back and some good workmanship all through the picture. The Madonna and Child are tender, almost plaintive in sentiment. The external evidence seems to point to Gossart but the picture is not too certainly by him.

1537. ——***Madonna and Child.*** It is hardly by Gossart. The chances are that it is a Memling school piece. It is good in sentiment and has a fine landscape.

806–812 **Greco, Il (Domenico Theotocopuli).** ***Portraits.*** A half dozen portraits by Il Greco that are interesting but have not that great value as art which an enthusiastic brotherhood of painters would have us believe. There is too much Il Greco and not enough sitter in them for good portraiture. In each case the character of the sitter is Greco-ised. This personality or individuality or even eccentricity of the painter is very welcome in figure compositions, but in portraiture too much of it may prove obtrusive. The sitter requires some measure of importance, the objective truth some positive recognition.

820. ——***St. John Evangelist and St. Francis.*** What dreadfully morbid and decadent colour but how wonderfully beautiful—beautiful as old cathedral glass which is at its best just before it is ready to crumble with decay! The most refined quality of colour usually is a little morbid; and the richest notes of all are those of time-deepened and decayed pigments.

822. * ——***Christ Bearing the Cross.*** A remarkable piece of bad drawing, impossible lighting, and still more impossible colouring; but, all told, what a decorative panel it is! In tapestry or glass it would be superb. And what intensity of feeling, what fervour there is about it! It is the painting of soul well by painting body ill—a method of expression first practised in mediæval art, but not unknown to more modern painting.

824. ** ——***The Dead Christ.*** This is a very good example of Il Greco—mannerisms and all. He must have had something wrong with his eyes—some convexity of vision—for his figures bulge large in

the middle and dwindle away at the head and feet. He is not only eccentric in drawing but peculiar in colour. It seems a most unhealthy vision after studying that of Velasquez in the next room, but it has very decided merits as art, which in its finest phases is somewhat removed from the natural and even the healthy or sensible. At any rate, there is nothing commonplace about Il Greco though his vision is distorted and limited and his method mannered. What beautiful colour is here shown! The angel at the left with the green robe —what an attractive creature! The dead figure of Christ, for all its sooty shadows, is a strong piece of drawing. Mind you, drawing may have another mission than producing a realistic appearance. There is beauty in line as line quite apart from the representation. Il Greco shows it. The clouds and the background are as usual with this painter. At some time he must have seen the work of the weaker Morales and been influenced by it. See the Morales, No. 943.

825. * ——*The Resurrection.* This picture and Nos. 821, 823, 828 are upright panels and one cannot help imagining what charming glass windows they would make. As they are, the colour is rather dark and wanting in luminosity. The drawing in No. 825 is mannered and the scene is, perhaps, overdramatic, but it is undeniably forceful. So, too, is No. 823, the Crucifixion, which is intense in feeling but more restrained in its demonstration than No. 825. The Baptism, No. 821, might have been done by a pupil, possibly the master's son, Jorge.

827. * ——*The Annunciation.* A beautiful, sketchy affair and in condition almost as the painter left it. The

colour is very effective. The influence of Tintoretto rather than Titian is here apparent not only in the whirl and action of it but in the architecture and light. The painter was a strange individuality —a creature swayed by temperament rather than by rule or reason.

1542. **Hemessen, Jan van.** ***Madonna and Child.*** The Child is restless but, generally speaking, the picture is good in sentiment and rather fine in colour. It was formerly ascribed to the Bellini.

2182. * **Holbein the Younger, Hans.** ***Portrait of an Old Man.*** This portrait was once supposed to be a Dürer but it comes nearer to being a Holbein. There is little certainty about its attribution to Holbein, however. It is an excellent portrait of a large-nosed, flabby-faced old man, handsomely done in the coat and with fairly well-drawn hands. Amberger might have painted it.

1543. **Jordaens, Jakob.** ***Judgment of Solomon.*** The picture is rather good in colour and composition though a little slight and perhaps pretty for Jordaens. It was formerly attributed to Rubens. It belongs to some Rubens follower other than Jordaens.

1544. ——***Marriage of St. Catherine.*** This picture, as also No. 1543, was formerly assigned to Rubens, where it was even less acceptable than to Jordaens. It apparently has very little of either painter in its make-up though by no means a poor picture.

1546. ——***Meleager and Atalanta.*** It is not Jordaens at his best. He is not to be found here at Madrid in his gayest colours and most brilliant workmanship. There is good painting, however, in the heads of this No. 1546.

1547. ——***Pomona.*** This is, perhaps, a genuine Jordaens though not more satisfactory than the other examples set down to him. The grouping is bad and the canvas is littered with unrelated material. There is good painting in spots and some good colour.

1550. ——***Three Musicians.*** A free sketch, extravagant in characterisation but possessed of considerable force. It is easily done. No. 1549 should be compared with the Borro portrait at Berlin (No. 413A) for resemblances of style. See the note on the Borro.

855. **Juanes, Juan de.** ***Portrait of Don Luis de Castelvi.*** An elaborately costumed portrait rather hard in its drawing, but of considerable force. It cannot be dismissed as the work of an unimportant painter, for it has too much life and character about it for that.

838–842 ——***Scenes from the Life of St. Stephen.*** Five panels from a retable showing to advantage the style of Juan de Juanes following Italy, probably at second hand, through the Italianised Flemings. It is respectable but not very interesting work.

504. **Leonardo da Vinci (Copy of).** ***Mona Lisa.*** Before and after the disappearance of the Mona Lisa from the Louvre there were not wanting "authorities" who claimed this portrait as the one and only original Mona Lisa; but one has only to study the hair, the white scarf, the eyes, brows, hands, shadows to be sure that it has all the timidity and weakness of a bad copy. It is so bad that one wonders how it ever could have been thought an original by any one.

240. * **Lotto, Lorenzo.** ***A Bridal Couple.*** Evidently these are portraits of a pair of lovers or married folk. They are richly dressed and held together by a genius of marriage at the top. Lotto himself described the work in his manuscript list of portraits, in the library at Bergamo, as "Messer Marsilio and his bride with the little Cupid." The shy little bride has Lotto's fine feeling, the man's face is a study, and even the little Love is a psychological problem. The picture is very charming and one of Lotto's most engaging studies, though it is not a mature piece of painting. It was saved from the fire of 1734 and has also escaped the restorer, though the hands are over-cleaned. Its decorative appeal is considerable. And its novelty does not go unnoticed. It is not often that the gallery haunter meets anything so out of the ordinary.

242. **Luini, Bernardino.** ***Holy Family.*** In sentiment it is merely sweet and over-done; in colour it is hot. This is one of Luini's facile performances —nothing more.

243. ——***The Daughter of Herodias.*** Even in tragic scenes Luini purls and prattles. He never rises to a pitch of pride or fury or tragedy. He lisps about murder and uses colours fitted for a lady's boudoir when he might have employed clarion tones. But that was the nature of the man. He never possessed or showed any real strength.

248. * **Mantegna, Andrea.** ***Death of the Virgin.*** A fine picture by a great master. What beautiful colour! What a wonderful setting of figures in an architectural frame looking out upon a superb landscape—a landscape modern enough in spirit to have been done yesterday! What fine types, robes,

embroidered borders, and candle holders! Notice the action of the figure with the palm at the left and the faces of the singers at the right. Finally, stand back and look at the *set-in* of the whole group, the tonal quality and the atmospheric effect of the picture. It belongs to Mantegna's early period.

1513 } **Master of Flémalle.** ***St. John and Donor and***
1514 } ***St. Barbara.*** Two panels that do not seem de-
* signed as a diptych and yet are undoubtedly by the same hand. They are, however, not two separate panels that have been brought together, but possibly parts of an altar-piece. The painter is likely the so-called Master of Flémalle. The St. Barbara in the green robe is very like the green-robed Magdalen in the National Gallery, London (No. 654), now attributed to (the School of) Robert Campin, which brings it within the Master of Flémalle's circle, the two being considered identical by modern critics. Just who did the Master of Flémalle pictures is, however, still in some doubt. The St. Barbara panel here is the more interesting in both composition and colour. The saint in her Gothic room is lovely in sentiment and colour, the drawing is sharp and accurate but not narrow or small, the still-life is excellent, and the little landscape is very picturesque. The interior is similar to that of the Annunciation (No. 2202) in the Louvre. The St. John panel (No. 1513) is in attitude and type less reminiscent of Van der Weyden—a suggestion made by Dr. Voll—than of Memling. The right hand and arm are retouched, as also the head of the donor. See No. 1887, assigned to Van der Weyden but possibly by the Master of Flémalle.

1557. * **Memling, Hans.** ***Adoration of Kings.*** This is said to be a repetition with variations of the triptych in the Hospital of St. John at Bruges. It has the look of a varied school copy, though the central panel is good enough for Memling himself. Replica or copy, it has decided merit. The Madonna of the central panel is charming in sentiment, the balanced composition is restful, and the landscape at the back very lovely. What superb reds, blues, greys, golds! And again what texture painting! The left wing is more prosaic, less satisfactory, than the right one. Notice the charming townscape in the right wing and the beautiful kneeling angels.

1559. **Metsys, Quentin.** ***Ecce Homo.*** A triptych of some dramatic quality. The drawing is perhaps sharp, especially in the hands, but it is, nevertheless, rather forceful. The colour is excellent—in the wings particularly. One cannot see it well in its present (basement) placing, but it seems to have distinct quality. The attribution to Metsys may be questioned. See also the Madonna No. 1562, put down to Metsys, and also the note on the Patinir (No. 1615).

57. **Michelangelo Buonarroti, School of.** ***The Flagellation of Christ.*** A picture of exaggerated drawing in the muscles and mannered use of the broken line to vary the flowing line, as, for instance, in the arms and elbows. It is an open question who did it—a question hardly worthy of much pursuit or argument.

943. **Morales, Luis de.** ***Presentation in the Temple.*** There is a mixture of styles and influences in this picture which was apparently much admired by no less a person than Il Greco. The beginnings of Il

Greco's mannerisms seem to show here. The picture is fairly good considering Morales was always a weak painter.

946. ——***Madonna and Child.*** The types seem the precursors of Il Greco's strange people. The sentiment is strained and the surface too smooth, but the colour is rather good.

2107. **Moro, Antonio.** ***Portrait of a Buffoon.*** The sitter looks more like a tragic actor than a buffoon. Even his deformities seem more tragic than amusing. A fine head and an excellent Moro.

2108. ——***Queen Mary of England.*** What a distinct and clear characterisation not only of the Queen but of the positive English type. Moro could, on occasion, keep himself out of a portrait or, at least, allow his sitter the proper prominence and subordinate himself. This portrait is done with exactness, tightness, even rigidity, as though poured in a form and cast, but with good results as regards the complete work. Moro never went beyond it. It is one of his masterpieces. Notice the modelling of the face and forehead. It is inexorable and unyielding but true after its kind. The canvas has an interesting history. It was painted for Charles V and seen by Philip II before the marriage with the English Queen. She holds in her hand the red rose of the House of Lancaster.

2110 } ——***Portrait of the Emperor and the Empress of***
2111 } ***Austria.*** These are state portraits—official affairs —but they are not to be dismissed lightly. They are hard in drawing but, nevertheless, imposing works. Their merit is, perhaps, more superficial than profound, but that, it may be supposed, suited the need and the occasion.

2114. * ——*Portrait of an Unknown Lady.* It is almost as good as a Holbein. The head is sharply drawn but full of character, of force, of truth. The hands are knotty, but is there not some truth of character —some truth of fact to the original—even in this? A fine portrait.

262. **Moroni, Giovanni Battista.** *Portrait of a Venetian Captain.* It is not one of Moroni's most compelling portraits. The figure stands badly and looks weary. Possibly both of these features were seen in the original. The head, however, is not well joined to the body, which was probably not so true to the original, and the background of wall and pilaster is awkward in its drawing. The red velvet is well done and also the hands.

888. **Mazo, Juan Bautista del.** *Mariana of Austria.* A portrait by the son-in-law of Velasquez and in the style of Velasquez but coarser, less noble, less true, though by no means a poor picture. Its simplicity and directness with a Velasquez breadth of view and treatment are all attractive. The background is excellent as is also the curtain at the left. It is an important Mazo.

889. * ——*View of Saragossa.* A commanding and impressive townscape with a big sweep of background, a fine sky, good atmosphere, and good colour. The well-drawn figures are said to be by Velasquez, but that merely means that they are thought to be by a different hand from the one that did the landscape. There seems little reason for such thinking. How well these figures hold their place in the foreground and keep in relation with the middle distance and background! Mazo, because he stood in a pupil's relation to Velasquez, is not to be dismissed with a

smile. He was a landscape painter of very pronounced ability. And there is nothing about these figures he could not have painted. The sky here has been repainted and the whole picture retouched by restorers.

1214. ——*Calle de la Reina.* An interesting if somewhat darkened landscape, formerly attributed to Velasquez, and as a Velasquez much praised by art writers. It has not changed of recent years, and as a Mazo is still to be admired. There are a dozen of these Mazo landscapes here in the Prado, and they are all worthy of study. Notice the sea piece No. 896 and the small picture No. 892.

972 } **Murillo, Bartholomé Estéban.** ***Immaculate***
974 } ***Conception.*** Two examples of a theme that Murillo painted a number of times. They are well enough done and not exactly negligible though they have (in company with the one in the Louvre) an exaggerated reputation. They are too sentimental and too pretty in colour to be of lasting excellence in art. One wearies of their lack of spirit and force. The drawing is feeble. Look at the hands and the eyes—to go no further.

993. * ——*St. Elizabeth of Hungary.* It is difficult to overcome one's prejudices against Murillo. He is so merely pretty, so wanting in technical force, so abounding in overwrought sentiment that one can have small patience in looking at a roomful of his pictures such as the one here in the Prado. He shows to better advantage at Seville, but the representation here is adequate enough. This St. Elizabeth picture is one of his best. It is not badly drawn though much posed in the figures, and is fairly well put together; but it is weak, wanting in

vim and spirit. Everything about it is soft and melting. The old woman on the step is the best figure in it. St. Elizabeth herself is velvety all through—the face as well as the dress. The colour lacks in distinction, as the light in truth. The foreground does not agree with the background in illumination. Had the background view at the right been curtained off, it would have matched and agreed with the left side of the picture. As it is, the lighting is arbitrary—different in each side. The whole picture proves unsatisfactory wherever you probe into it. But it is celebrated and much admired.

975. ——***The Virgin of the Rosary.*** A typical Murillo Madonna that irresistibly awakens memories of cheap chromo reproductions. The prettiness and the weakness of it will not down. Even a physically hardened character like St. Jerome (No. 988) appears soft, smooth, and delicate to Murillo's eye and brush.

962, 964, 965. ——***The Infant Christ.*** Here is Murillo in his most popular phase—at his best technically, perhaps, and at his worst sentimentally. How sadly inferior they are, how wanting in vitality! They are powder-box affectations.

961. ——***Adoration of Shepherds.*** Perhaps this picture is as satisfactory as any Murillo in the room. The kneeling shepherd does not kneel well but his feet, head, and hands are not badly done. Everything else in the picture is too smoothly sentimental, including the sheep, the cow, and the chickens. Inevitably, mental strength or weakness betrays itself through the brush as through the pen, and obviously Murillo was not Velasquez.

978 } ——***Altar-Pieces.*** These are large canvases with
979 } effective subjects for church worship but with not enough real art about them to stand the glare of gallery exposition.

1022–1025 } **Pacheco, Francisco.** ***Four Saints.*** These four panels are by the first master and the father-in-law of Velasquez. They are interesting in the history of Spanish art. The drawing is hard and rather rudimentary but very honest. Pacheco was a writer as well as a painter and a man of note in his day.

269. **Palma Vecchio.** ***Adoration of Shepherds.*** It has a look of Palma but possibly comes nearer to, say, Bonifazio or his school. The Madonna and Child are slightly reminiscent of Titian as are also the shepherds. The landscape is a bit crude, the colour excellent. It is by no means a poor picture though now in rather bad condition.

1037. **Pantoja de la Cruz, Juan.** ***Portrait of an Unknown Lady.*** A very beautiful dress, done in the Sanchez Coello style but with less accuracy. The type is a lofty one and perhaps the painter shows some consciousness of that fact. The colour is dull and the sitter is rather subordinated to the dress.

1031. ——***Queen Isabella of Valois.*** In the style of Antonio Moro or Sanchez Coello. The painter was a pupil of the latter. It is official portraiture but has considerable "go" about it.

1033. ——***Charles V.*** It is too hard and uncompromising in its rigidity. Look at the table, for instance. As for the sitter, all portraits of him here at Madrid pale before the Titian.

279. **Parmigianino, Francesco Mazzola.** ***Portrait of a Man, probably Lorenzo Cibo.*** With a less disturbing background, the vista at the right omitted, and the name of a great painter on the frame we might think this a very good portrait. The head is well done if rather slippery in the handling. The painter was inclined to be overfacile with his brush and not serious enough in his mental attitude.

280. ——***Portrait of a Lady and Three Children.*** These are probably the wife and children of Lorenzo Cibo shown in the portrait No. 279. The figures are too conscious in their attitudes and the whole picture shows mannerisms, but the costumes are beautiful and the painting is decidedly good.

1611. * **Patinir, Joachim.** ***Flight into Egypt.*** This is the same Madonna in blue and white, with basket and bags, that one meets with elsewhere under the names of David and Isenbrant. The landscape is more varied and spotty than in No. 1615 or No. 1613. It is a handsome work, however, though a little harsh in its relations of light and colour and not having the warmth of No. 1613.

1612. * ——***Flight into Egypt.*** A landscape with more tonal quality in it than any of the others here given to Patinir. It may be questioned if Patinir did it, but it is a handsome landscape.

1613. * ——***Flight into Egypt.*** There are at least half a dozen of these Flights into Egypt, with a Madonna in blue seated on a bank and beside her a basket and white bag, in the European galleries—notably at Berlin (No. 608) and Antwerp (No. 64). They are variously assigned to Patinir, David, Isenbrant, et al. This one seems somewhat repainted

in the face of the Madonna and Child, but the group is, nevertheless, a charming one. In its present basement placing (1912) it cannot be properly seen. Once attributed to Lucas van Leyden.

1614. ——*Landscape.* In the same vein as shown in the landscape of No. 1615 but it is now (1912) badly hung and difficult to see.

1615. * ——*Temptation of St. Anthony.* A fine, big landscape with figures supposed to have been painted by Jerome Bosch. The figures are certainly graceful and make a brilliant spot of colour and light on the dark ground. What sweeping robes and attractive poses! But the landscape is the better part of the picture. Patinir never did anything finer. The scene is panoramic but holds together extremely well. The figures were formerly thought to be by Quentin Metsys and are so thought by some present-day critics. They are excellent.

1616. * ——*Landscape.* With a dawn effect behind the hills—or at least it may be so regarded without distortion of meaning. A fine view of sea and land, a little hard, to be sure, but true as well as decorative. And probably by Patinir. It seems to have more indications of authenticity than many other examples ascribed to him.

1617. ——*St. Francis.* A picture of merit but with little about it to indicate Patinir. There is fine tonal quality in it. It is probably by the painter of No. 1612, whoever he may be.

1317. **Pereda y Salgado, Antonio.** An ill-drawn and rather heavily painted picture that has good colour about it. Even the roses are hard and heavy but

handsome. Whether the picture is by Pereda or not, who knows?

345. * **Piombo, Sebastiano del.** ***Christ Bearing the Cross.*** Large and Michelangelesque in the hands and drapery with a suggestion of Giorgione and Venetian painting in the figures at the left, especially the warrior in armour. The figure of Christ is grandly done but not over-done in either action or agony. The drapery and hands are excellent. The landscape is half Venetian and so, too, is the colour. The high light in the robe is washed out after the Florentine manner of the time. Somewhat blackened and injured, and also doubted by some as regards its authenticity, but it is nearer to Sebastiano than any other painter we now know. Another version at St. Petersburg (No. 17) and several replicas in European galleries with no great certainty about any of them.

287. **Pontormo (Jacopo Carucci).** ***Holy Family.*** It is a little heavy in spirit and lacking in original impulse. The Madonna is reminiscent of Andrea del Sarto, which possibly accounts for the attribution to Pontormo, who was a pupil of Andrea.

288. **Pordenone, Giovanni Antonio Licinio.** ***Madonna with St. Roch and St. Anthony of Padua.*** This picture is now given to Pordenone though it was long considered a Giorgione and is so yet by some critics. Its attribution makes little difference to the lover of art for its own sake rather than for its name or pedigree. The picture is of small merit whoever painted it. The Madonna and Child are not inferior, in fact, they are very good in sentiment, drapery, colour; but the chief interest in them is archæological rather than æsthetic. Did

they inspire the Gipsy Madonna put down to Titian at Vienna (No. 176) or were they deliberately taken from the Gipsy Madonna and here reproduced by some second-rate follower of Titian and Giorgione? The latter suggestion is the more probable because the rest of the picture does not show a skilled hand and is rather cheaply done. The green drapery at the back, the white banner, the stone ledge, and the landscape are crude; the St. Francis is more or less foolish; and the St. Roch is a make-believe, a dummy figure. The St. Roch is in pose and figure seen again in Cariani's Woman Taken in Adultery (No. 11) in the Bergamo Gallery, which is suggestive of this Madrid picture, for it is about up to the level of a mediocre Cariani. There is nothing about it that could not have been done by any one of half a dozen Giorgione followers. If Giorgione himself had to rest his fame on this work we should hardly see his name to-day in the Venetian empyrean. The picture has been injured by repainting and was, perhaps, never finished originally.

289. ——***Portrait of an Unknown Lady.*** This portrait has been so injured that one can hardly guess at its origin. It is pretty certainly not by Pordenone. It is still attractive though all quality in the paint itself has been submerged and lost in the cleaning-room processes.

2131. **Potter, Paul.** ***Landscape with Cattle.*** In the style of Potter—that is, with a dark sky, hard cattle, and dry painting. It is fairly well drawn.

296. **Raphael Sanzio.** ***Holy Family.*** It is an early and a genuine Raphael, in good condition, but not an important example of the painter by any means.

The sentiment is pure enough but not very intense and the colour is neither good nor bad. The picture lacks in repose and is, perhaps, rendered top-heavy by the Joseph who stands badly and has enormous hands—the right one slightly abraded. The Madonna and Child are, on the contrary, gracefully done with good drapery. The figures are placed well on the panel and there is a charming landscape at the back.

297. ——***Virgin of the Fish.*** This is a large picture but not a satisfactory or even a good Raphael. He probably did little more than prepare the design for it. The composition is balanced, formal, and very apparent. The placing of the Madonna on the platform, the drawing of the step, the chair, the curtain, the lion are all rather clumsily carried out. The Madonna herself is graceful enough but the appearance of the left foot is awkward. The angel and Tobit are the most attractive of the figures. The colour is not wonderful and the flesh-notes are hectic. The surface suggests the presence of more than one hand. Somewhat injured by cleaning and repainting.

298. ——***Christ Bearing the Cross (Lo Spasimo).*** It is a large picture possibly designed by Raphael and probably painted by Giulio Romano or some one very near to him. It is a very good group and a good picture though now injured and repainted. The figures are rather academic, the colour overwarm, the landscape impressive.

299. * ——***Portrait of Cardinal Alidosio.*** An imposing portrait not only in its costume of red but in its thin-visaged sitter. The drawing is clear-cut in the outlines and accented in the brows, nose, and

mouth. The eyes are striking though a bit conventional. Of course this is not portraiture of a Titian-Velasquez kind or quality, but nevertheless, and for all its thin handling, it is very positive and compelling work. It is simple, true so far as it goes, and precise. How well the reds are used and the white of the sleeve is given! It has not depth nor body, it shows little more than two dimensions, but you still cannot get away from the fact that it is a notable performance in portraiture. The surface is glassy and uncomfortable. On wood and cleaned too much.

300. ——***Visitation.*** It is not by Raphael though his name is written upon it in letters of gold. A version of the head of St. Elizabeth is in the Louvre (No. 1509 bis) under the same magic name of Raphael, but that proves nothing for either picture. This, however, is Raphaelesque and belongs somewhere in the school or shop of Giulio Romano. The figures are well drawn, the baptism at the back is graceful in its small figures, the colour is rather hot. Injured and somewhat repainted.

301. ——***Holy Family*** (***La Perla***). This picture is probably by the painter of No. 303 though there is some variation in the workmanship. It came out of Giulio Romano's workshop in all probability. The shadows are blackish, the blues disagreeably cold, the Madonna unduly pretty, and St. Elizabeth consciously sibylesque. The vista with St. Joseph at the left is very good. It is a hard, glittering picture that has been kept alive for many years because of the name of Raphael tacked to it.

302. ——***Madonna of the Rose.*** This is another of the supposed Raphaels in the Prado which does not

stand up well under examination. It is fairly well composed and the drapery is handsome. The colour, too, is attractive. But the Raphaelesque tang or air about it is one that was given very often by Raphael's numerous followers. This is probably some sort of Raphael amalgam produced by pupils in his school. Possibly Raphael designed it. It has been much retouched.

303. ——***Holy Family.*** The cold blues and the landscape in this picture with the green of the robe and the sooty flesh suggest some one of the Ferrarese School following Raphael though it is more probably of the School of Giulio Romano. It is certainly not by Raphael and just as certainly not a great picture.

304. ——***Portrait of Andrea Navagera.*** This portrait is nowhere near Raphael nor is it a work of any great merit. This statement is equally true of No. 305. They are copies after portraits in the Doria Gallery, Rome.

2132. **Rembrandt van Ryn.** ***Queen Artemisia.*** The central figure of the queen is rather fine in costume and flowing hair. The bulk of the figure is also well given and the head well drawn. The attendant figures are done in a more perfunctory manner. The picture has not the look of a Rembrandt, and the pallid colour rather suggests the painter of the Young Girl (No. 812) in the Hermitage and the Samson at Berlin (No. 802). The signature is entirely too prominent, as though the signer was fearful the picture could not speak for itself. The queen is said to be a likeness of Saskia—the painter's wife—though no one knows exactly why except

that every light-haired model in Rembrandtesque pictures is alleged to be a Saskia.

1062. **Ribalta, Francisco de.** ***St. Francis.*** It is hard in the drawing of the saint but has a certain realism, manifest in the hands and feet, that influenced Ribera and perhaps pointed the way for the young Velasquez. The angel is rather unusual in action and interesting in colour.

1065. ——***St. John and St. Matthew.*** The passion of it is extravagant and the shadows are blackish, following the later Italian formula of Caravaggio, but the drawing (in the feet and hands) is very well done.

1078. **Ribera, Jusefe (Lo Spagnoletto).** ***St. Andrew.***
* A strong piece of modelling. It is difficult to conjure up in the memory a picture that goes beyond it in the matter of realistic modelling. What a head and what a body! Never mind its brutal blackness, some of which has come by time; at least it is truthful in drawing. Perhaps it is not decoratively pleasing but it has power.

1115. ——***A Hermit.*** A very good Ribera with much
* truth to fact in the drawing of the back, shoulders, arm, hand, head. Of course it is blackish in the shadows—more now than when painted. Ribera followed Caravaggio and came by his blackness and his realism (brutal at times) honestly enough.

1069. ——***The Trinity.*** The composition is a little uneasy and awkward and the colour is rather brilliant for Ribera. Had he seen the work of Il Greco at the time this picture was done? There is something about it that recalls the Dead Christ of Il Greco in the long gallery of this Prado Museum.

1101. * ——*Martyrdom of St. Bartholomew.* There is a roomful of Riberas in the Prado, but they throw no new light on his artistic personality so well known through his many pictures in European galleries. Most of the pictures in this room are inferior to the St. Andrew (No. 1078). The St. Bartholomew (No. 1101) is the central panel on the east wall and is possibly the second Ribera in the gallery. The drawing and colouring are both excellent.

323. **Romano, Giulio.** *Noli me Tangere.* The figure of Christ wants in right feeling and in dignity. The action is theatrical and the mood seems flippant. With cold, rather forbidding colour. It is probably not by Giulio. No. 322 comes nearer to his style but is not an important picture. See the notes on the Raphaels in this gallery for works executed by Giulio Romano.

1637. **Rubens, Peter Paul.** *The Brazen Serpent.* This canvas is conspicuously signed at the bottom with the name of Rubens, which is so suspicious that one is not surprised to find every feature of it proclaiming its maker to be Van Dyck. Compare it with the Van Dyck Betrayal (No. 1477 of this gallery) in the hands, heads, draperies, painting of the hair, colour of the robes and flesh. Compare also the nude shoulders and bodies of the men in each. There is little doubt of its being a Van Dyck. It may have been touched by his master, Rubens, but even that is not at all certain. It is a palpable Van Dyck probably adapted from the Rubens in the National Gallery, London (No. 59), in the execution of which Van Dyck also had a hand.

1638. ——*Adoration of Kings.* An early Rubens done for the town hall in Antwerp about 1610, taken

afterward to Madrid, and there, later on, perhaps changed somewhat by Rubens himself. It is not a satisfactory picture, and it is difficult to imagine Rubens designing such a huddled group, though the diagonal composition which he so much affected is here, with some of his brilliant colouring, some of his types, and his own portrait at the far right. As for the drawing, it is pinched in scale, notably in the three kings, in the Joseph, in the Child. In other places the drawing seems almost grotesque, as in the small page in the foreground, in the kneeling king whose hands and arms do not agree with his head, in the bust of the Madonna, in the heads of the camels. Again, the painting of it is uneven. Look at the wriggling, snake-like hair of the kneeling king, the badly rendered gold vessel in his hands, the feather in the hat of the negro king that repeats the smoke of the torches and looks like smoke, the hot flesh-notes of the Cupid at the top. The whole picture is imposing at first blush but does not bear analysis too well. One hardly knows what to think of it. Was Rubens ever such a blunderer with the brush at any time? It is difficult to imagine him doing that arbour and the dreadful vine hanging from it or those weird camels with the dying donkey just below them. Compared with the later Adoration at Antwerp (No. 298), this is a very tame affair and almost incredible.

1640. * ——***Holy Family.*** It is not easy to find among the many pictures attributed to Rubens here in the Prado a picture that now shows his undisturbed brush-work to advantage. The whole group of Rubenses here is disappointing. Some of them are careless originals, others are merely workshop pic-

tures, many of them have been sadly repainted, and none of them shows the great skill and supreme flowing brush of this great master of painting. This Holy Family, perhaps, comes as near to him as anything in the gallery, and even in this there is some doubt about his having done certain parts of it. It is probably the first thought, the first attempt for a larger picture now in the National Gallery, London (No. 67). It is decently drawn, with good colour and a fine landscape, whereas the larger London picture, done in his workshop by pupils, perhaps, is ill drawn, with a poor landscape and with very careless handling. Yet it is such pictures as this No. 1640 in the Prado that must be used to judge Rubens's pictures here. Allowance, of course, must be made for the destruction of surfaces by cleaning and repainting. With Rubens's larger pictures on canvas it is not to be supposed that their surfaces should be intact or their brilliancy of colour should be now as when originally laid in by the master. Reliance must be upon design and drawing more than upon surfaces. And again some allowance must be made for variation in the styles of the master. His later handling is looser than his earlier, but neither of them revealed ineffectual work or bad drawing.

1642. ——*The Dead Christ.* The colour is chalky as though scumbled over by a later hand than that of Rubens. The design is a little weak and lacks in force and that large command of line and form for which Rubens was famous. The figure of Christ is wanting in vigour, in strength. And the relation of the white sheet to the white body is not well given, has no great decision about it. The drawing is not false or untrue but merely weak.

Possibly the picture was prettified in the execution by a pupil.

1644. ——***St. George and the Dragon.*** The picture has no marked quality but is freely, slashingly, and probably hastily done. Its surface is quite different from some of the loose, "bready" surfaces in the long gallery here. Rubens must have been a person of vast unevenness of handling if all these varying canvases are to be put down to his brush. This one should perhaps be assigned to him, though pupils may have worked upon it. The canvas is pieced out.

1645. ——***Religious Ceremony of Rudolph of Hapsburg.*** There is no reason to think that Rubens did any part of it. The catalogue gives the landscape to Wildens. Why not the whole picture to him?

1650. ——***St. Philip.*** This head and Nos. 1646, 1648, 1653, 1654, 1656—all of them hanging on the line together—are, loosely speaking, in the manner of Rubens but probably not by him. There are weaknesses here and there that look as though pupils may have worked upon them or copied them from other originals. They are commonplace. And yet the brush-work in the hair and beards is nearer to Rubens than that of many of the larger and more important-looking canvases. But they are not interesting works and there is something very questionable about them.

1658. * ——***Centaurs and Lapiths.*** This and the following pictures marked "Metamorphoses Series," and taken from Ovid, were done in Rubens's workshop at Antwerp and sent in 1638 to King Philip at Madrid for his shooting-lodge, called the Torre

de la Parada. Over a hundred pictures were sent to Madrid in 1638, and it was physically impossible that Rubens could have done them all. He designed them and left the execution to assistants in the shop. The pictures declare this to-day. There is hardly a canvas among them that shows the complete work and hand of Rubens. This Centaur picture (No. 1679) is typical of the "Metamorphoses Series." It has spirited action and good drawing, but if any one imagines that red drapery, for instance, is a Rubens red, or that the drawing of the figure under it, or the head of the satyr is by Rubens, then he knows not the great Fleming. It is the work of assistants. The original sketch was made by Rubens and is now in the collection of the Duke of Osuna, but the picture was executed in the Rubens workshop. Rubens did not maintain a roomful of pupils without getting some substantial work out of them. Metamorphoses Series.

1659. ——*Rape of Proserpina.* It belongs to the Rubens workshop, with the design probably by the master and the execution by pupils. Rubens may have touched it with a few final strokes, but the crudity of the high lights on the hair, armour, feathers point to a less certain brush than his. And the drawing of Proserpina's arms, especially the right one, what can be said in defence of it? Metamorphoses Series.

1660. ——*Banquet of Tereus.* There is much tragic fury about it and much headlong action. The design speaks for Rubens, the execution for assistants. It is not badly done. The architecture is subordinated but not put in like a half-melted palace

of ice, as in the Garden of Love (No. 1690), with which it might be compared. Yet the Garden of Love is said to be "all Rubens"! Metamorphoses Series.

1661. * ——*Achilles Discovered.* Compare for clarity and purity, with some certainty in the handling, this picture with the Garden of Love (No. 1690) near it. Compare the architecture, for instance, or the handling of the dresses, or the flesh-notes with their shadows, or the colour notes of red, blue, and gold. Compare especially the handling of the hair. There is a decided difference in the pictures, though neither shows the unimpaired brush of Rubens. There is more of Rubens, perhaps, in this No. 1661 than in the No. 1690, but the canvas has been much cleaned and restored, and the surface is greatly injured. Notice the head, neck, and cheek of the nearest figure holding a mirror, how they have been flattened in drawing and distorted in colour. There is, however, some brilliancy left in the picture. Rubens "touched" the picture with his "own hand," as he expressed it, and yet it is not now typical or characteristic of him. Rubens said that it was by "the best of his pupils," and Van Dyck is thought to have been meant in that reference; but how very little of Van Dyck there is in it! Not in the Metamorphoses Series but done some twenty years earlier; that is, about 1618.

1662. * ——*Atalanta and Meleager.* It is a very good landscape though crude in its mass of central shadow, and cruder still in its perfunctory, guessed-at high lights. There is good movement about the small figures. Rubens may have done it, though one may be pardoned for entertaining doubts about it.

But the general effect is good—too good for, say, Wildens or Van Uden, but not good enough for Rubens. It is similar to the Brussels landscape No. 391.

1663. * ——***Andromeda and Perseus.*** Undoubtedly from the design of Rubens and possibly executed in part by his hand. The figure of Perseus is slight, but that of Andromeda is rather fine. Notice the depth of red in the cloak of Perseus and also the painting of his armour. Notice also the Cupid above and the fine sea and sky at the back. Somewhat pieced out, injured, and repainted, but with something of Rubens still in it. The figure of Andromeda is possibly a variation of that in the Berlin picture (No. 776c). Sent to Spain after the painter's death.

1664. ——***Ceres and Pomona.*** It is very like No. 1672, with fruit supposed to be by Snyders and figures supposed to be by Rubens. The surfaces in both pictures deny and contradict the surfaces in other pictures put down to Rubens. They are probably both the work of assistants, who may have "finished" the picture after Rubens's death. This one is still pure and clean in the fruit though hurt in the figures.

1665. ——***Diana and Nymphs Surprised by Satyrs.*** For a processional composition it has great movement, and the figures are handsomely knit together in a long, frieze-like group. Rubens planned it, without doubt, but the execution must be assigned to that Antwerp picture factory over which he presided. Look closely at the brush-work in the heads and the hair. Rubens, the most fluid writer with the brush in the history of art, never did such heavy work at any time in his career. It is more

like the work of Quellen. The canvas speaks for itself, and no documentary record about it is needed in contravention or denial.

1667. ——***Orpheus and Euridice.*** The same tale is told here as in No. 1658. The sketch for the picture is in the collection of the Duke of Osuna; but the picture was probably done by pupils and touched by Rubens's own hand—no more. It is not here or elsewhere a question of whether one prefers a smooth or a rough surface, but rather the sort of surface that Rubens produced. He never at any time did the bready surface of the aged Titian or missed his drawing with the broad brush of the aged Hals. He died before his hand began to fail or there was any decline in his sureness of touch. His later work was, of course, looser and freer than his earlier work, but it was not less sure and true in its larger drawing. Metamorphoses Series.

1668. * ——***The Milky Way.*** It is possibly the most satisfactory of the Metamorphoses Series and altogether one of the best workshop Rubenses in the gallery so far as its surface condition is concerned. The most superficial observer must see a brilliancy and clarity of flesh-notes here not perceptible in the other large works near at hand. It is a little careless in its doing, having been worked upon by assistants, but it is properly drawn, full of animation, and decorative in colour. The infant is unsatisfactory, and the chariot is a little tawdry in effect, even theatrical, but there are spirit, life, and colour about it. Metamorphoses Series.

1669. ——***Judgment of Paris.*** The figures here, as in other pictures by Rubens in the Prado, were probably designed by Rubens, painted by pupils or as-

sistants, and afterward gone over by the master here and there. One misses in it the brilliancy of his flesh-notes and occasionally wonders over the drawing of his assistants—the left arm of Paris, for instance, or the hands of the Graces. The landscape is all shop work. Injured and much restored.

1670. * ——***The Three Graces.*** Three effectively drawn figures, proceeding originally from Rubens's hand, but not now revealing much of that hand or the painter's flesh colour. The flesh is too pallid and has some of the chalkiness of the cleaning room in it, with spots of repainting here and there. But the figures are gracefully done, stand well, hold together well. The arabesque about them and the landscape were probably added by assistants. Thought by some critics to be a Rubens masterpiece, but there are better. Sent to Spain after the painter's death.

1671. ——***Diana and Calisto.*** A school piece all through with some bad drawing and very indifferent painting about it. Notice the hips, arms, neck, head, right leg and foot of the figure showing her back, in the centre of the picture. Notice the cheap painting of the urn in the centre, the still-life at the right, the fountain with the spouting head at the back, or the tree with its trunk, branches, and foliage. The small vista of landscape is very good. Sent to Spain after the painter's death.

1672. ——***Ceres and Pan.*** If this figure of Ceres was painted by Rubens, how shall we reconcile it with the figures in the Judgment of Paris (No. 1669) hanging opposite? Notice the difference in the flesh, the robes, the doing of the hair. Did Rubens do either of them? The difference between the

pictures is not explainable on the theory of the painter having different styles at different periods. The variation is too great. It means the work of different hands. The Ceres is merely by a different assistant from the one who produced the Graces—that is all. The landscape is, of course, attributed to Wildens.

1673. ——***Mercury and Argus.*** The Rubens sketch for this is in the collection of the Duke of Osuna, and that is about as far as Rubens went with the picture. The execution is assistants' work. The Argus smacks of Van Dyck, though one knows scarcely how or why. It was repeated probably from the Rubens at Dresden (No. 962c). Almost any one could have done the animal at the left and not drawn it any worse. It looks like Quellen's work. Metamorphoses Series.

1674. ——***Fortune.*** A graceful figure corresponding in a general way to the Ganymede (No. 1679), both of them decorative panels and little more. The Fortune has good movement about it—good lines. The surface is greyed by scumblings of paint and the colour lacks in purity and clarity. It has been clumsily handled in the drapery and background. Rubens designed it and some one of Quellen's calibre painted it. The sketch for it is in the Berlin Gallery (No. 798c). Metamorphoses Series.

1677. ——***Mercury.*** A somewhat academic figure, standing easily and wearing the symbols of Jove's messenger, but not remarkable in any way. Metamorphoses Series.

1678. ——***Saturn.*** A repulsive subject but no one but
* Rubens could have so conjured it up in imagination

or so placed the design upon canvas. It is a rather fine piece of drawing with some of the painting evidently by Rubens himself. Look, for example, at the freedom and effectiveness with which the hair is brushed in and compare it with the thumbed and matted-with-paint hair of almost any other Rubens in the gallery. The child is repainted in spots. Metamorphoses Series.

1679. ——*Ganymede.* A graceful figure beautifully designed by Rubens but with a poorly painted surface by some one of his assistants. The handwriting of the master brushman is not here. Metamorphoses Series.

1685. ——*Portrait of Marie de Médicis.* A portrait that has been hurt by scrubbing but not by repainting. The flesh is chalk white and the background was never finished. The result is the two are now out of tone. Originally, no doubt, a fine start at a portrait. It still has fine qualities about it. At least it is Rubens we see here and not his shopmen. What superb grace and charm in the poise of the head and the placing of the hands! And what masterful drawing! How the master rises above his men even though the work be incomplete and in bad condition! Carry this surface into the long gallery and compare it with the surfaces in the Metamorphoses Series. It is a very different story told here.

1687. ——*Portrait of the Infante Ferdinand.* An official portrait, no doubt, but with some good work about it. The battle of Nördlingen is going on in the background, but the commander has time to look away and pose for his portrait. Such pictures shed no new light on the genius of Rubens or the realm

of art. They are merely commercial ventures—things to keep the pot boiling.

1688. * ——***Sir Thomas More.*** A very good portrait with a pale but distinct resemblance to the work of Holbein. It is said to be a copy by Rubens after Holbein, and it looks like an enlarged Holbein painted by some masterful Flemish brush. It does not exactly speak for Rubens, but then Rubens probably moderated his brush utterances to suit the smooth surface of the Holbein. It is a good picture, nevertheless, with rather fine colour. The personality of the sitter is attractive.

1689. ——***Portrait of a French Princess.*** It is a variation of the so-called Elizabeth of France in the Louvre (No. 2112) and in reality a portrait of Anne of Austria. It is attenuated, rather frail, and not very suggestive of Rubens as its painter. Another version in the Morgan Collection, New York.

1690. * ——***The Garden of Love.*** There are other and smaller versions of this picture at Vienna and Dresden, put down as copies, and this Madrid picture is claimed as the original. Perhaps the claim is just, but there are discrepancies and contradictions here that cannot be explained. It does not entirely agree with Rubens as one sees him in the galleries of Paris, Antwerp, Brussels, Berlin, Munich, Vienna. There is a lack of certainty in the drawing as in the touch of the brush. Look, for instance, at the hair, the harsh high lights on the jaws, shoulders, throats, the drawing of the musician in the centre, the square, flat laps of the women, the architecture at the back, the doves at the left, the peacock at the right. Rubens seems to have imparted some brilliancy to the central figures by

touching them here and there. For the rest of the picture, it is none too good for workshop manufacture. A great many of these Madrid Rubenses belong to that class. They are summarily done, as though for some distant barbarian king who would not know the difference between the master's hand and that of his pupils. This picture was probably executed after Rubens's design by the same hand that painted the Holy Family in the National Gallery, London (No. 67).

1691. * ——***A Dance of Peasants.*** There is a very good swing to the circle of figures and good colour to the picture. It is possibly by Rubens's own hand though there may be some doubts about it. The drawing is fairly good and the landscape is acceptable though not startling. The same theme differently treated, and by the same hand, is seen in the Kermess in the Louvre (No. 2115). They are both good works, but did Rubens do them? See the note on the Louvre picture.

1692. * ——***Adam and Eve.*** This is a copy by Rubens of the Titian (No. 429) in this gallery, with some variations, notably the introduction of the red note in the parrot. The Adam seems distinctly improved in the copy, but the Eve is less attractive, less graceful, less Italian and more Flemish. Those who prefer Italian to Flemish art will probably think the Titian the better picture. The latter is near at hand and may be compared.

1693. ——***Rape of Europa.*** A copy, supposed to be by Rubens, of the Titian belonging to Mrs. Gardner at Boston. It shows neither painter to advantage and is now merely curious.

332. **Sarto, Andrea del.** ***Portrait of Lucrezia Fede.***
* The sitter is doubtless Andrea's wife, and done by him, but whether as a portrait or part of another picture no one knows. It has been pieced out on the four sides of it. A handsome picture of a Florentine beauty, good in colour as in light-and-shade.

333. ——***Madonna and Child.*** It is badly placed in the gallery (1912) and probably much injured, which may account for its placing. It is blackish in the shadows and perhaps Andrea had nothing to do with it.

334. ——***Holy Family with Angel.*** It was undoubtedly inspired by Andrea and is an imposing pyramidal composition but is not inherently strong. It has probably suffered much in its surface. The sky and background look scumbled with grey paint. The colour is agreeable but is wanting in clarity, resonance, strength. It is not Andrea at his best —not as we see him in the galleries at Florence.

335. ——***Holy Family.*** The picture cannot be seen to advantage because of its placing on the wall. It seems injured, is heavy in spirit and poor in execution. The attribution may be questioned.

336. ——***Sacrifice of Abraham.*** It is a version of the
* [illegible] in the Dresden Gallery (No. 77) and has the appearance of a freely done first sketch by Andrea himself. The Abraham is colossal; the Isaac is twisted in the shoulders, as he should be, and has beautifully drawn legs and a fine torso. The landscape is dark and there is a good tree at the left. Notice the freely done garments of Isaac.

337. ——***Madonna and Child.*** The drawing of the Child's legs and of the Madonna's hands is too

bad for Andrea. The colour, too, is frail and wanting in quality. The type is that of Lucrezia Fede (Andrea's wife), but the picture, in spite of that, is probably a study or an old copy by some pupil. The right hand is again Andrea's, but sadly exaggerated in its bad drawing by the pupil. Cleaned and rubbed.

338. ——***Madonna and Child.*** This is another version of No. 333, though it has the smoothness suggestive of a copy. It is something of a puzzle to know just what was Andrea's part in such work as this. There are many canvases of similar quality put down to him in the European galleries.

1298. **Spanish School (15th Century).** ***Descent from Cross.*** There is small doubt of its being a copy after Roger van der Weyden. It is interesting for what it tells us about Roger but not otherwise.

1796. **Teniers the Younger, David.** ***The Smokers.*** There is a roomful of pictures here by Teniers the Younger through which the student may stroll at leisure. Perhaps No. 1796 is as good as any, but none of them is remarkable save for good technique—clever handling. One seldom hears of the authenticity of a Teniers being doubted; but had he no clever pupils? Did he do everything assigned to him?

356. **Tiepolo, Domenico.** ***Christ at the Column.*** This and half a dozen companion pieces here were painted for the Convent of St. Philip Neri by Domenico, the son of Giovanni Battista Tiepolo. It is worth while calling attention to the fact that there was a son since the father is usually credited with the son's work, as well as all the work of the Tiepolo shop.

363. **Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista.** ***The Immaculate Conception.*** Painted for the church of the Convent of San Pascual of Aranguez. A slight enough conception but serious, cleverly painted, good in colour, and highly decorative. It is, perhaps, by the son, Domenico, rather than the father. Somewhat injured at the top and with square patches added at the corners.

*

364. ——***The Eucharist.*** This is even less surely by Giovanni Tiepolo than No. 363. It is a bit sweet for the Elder and more like the Younger Tiepolo. Injured.

393. **Tintoretto, Jacopo (Robusti).** ***Purification of the Midianite Virgins.*** Graceful figures in bright, raw-hued garments in a crude landscape. Probably by some follower of Tintoretto. Said to have been bought by Velasquez for Philip IV on his second Italian journey, but probably Velasquez did not think it a Tintoretto. He bought it, doubtless, because it was a graceful, decorative canvas and cared little about who painted it.

390. ——***The Beheading of Holofernes.*** It belongs to the school work of Tintoretto and is not an important canvas in any way. The colour is flashy and spotty and the light false.

398. ——***Paradise.*** This is said to be another Velasquez purchase for Philip IV in Venice which shows that Velasquez either did not know his Tintoretto very well or (what is more likely) could find nothing better to purchase. It is a variation of the Paradise at Venice by a weaker brush than Tintoretto's.

397. ——***Baptism of Christ.*** A picture doubtless of Tintoretto's inspiration, and not a very good pic-

ture at that, but probably not by the master's own hand. The figures are graceful and the landscape attractive but Tintoretto's strength is lacking. Originally rounded at the top.

399. ——***Battle by Land and Sea.*** This is a jumble of figures, horses, masts, sails, gondolas, sea, mountains. It lacks space, air, coherence though it has some good light and colour. It is probably some sort of Tintoretto school piece in which the master had a finishing hand, but it is not a notable performance. The best Tintorettos in Spain are still at the Escorial.

386. * ——***Susanna.*** This picture and Nos. 388, 389, 394, 395, and 396 are sketches by Tintoretto for larger pictures and are delightful in every way. The student can compare them with the alleged Tintorettos hanging below them and see for himself the difference in the colouring, drawing, and handling. The Susanna and the Chastity of Joseph show splendid nudes; and what lovely pieces of colour are the Esther and the Queen of Sheba pictures! After their kind these sketchy little pictures show Tintoretto to supreme advantage. He did many things more forceful, more imposing in style and size, but few more attractive things as form and colour.

379. ——***Portrait of a Venetian Senator.*** Of the half dozen supposed Tintoretto portraits in this room there is not one that a person can rave over. Nos. 377 and 379 are as good as any without being in any way remarkable. They are all doubtful in their attribution to Tintoretto.

407. * **Titian (Tiziano Vecellio).** ***Portrait of Himself.*** This is Titian's latest way of seeing and doing

when everything had become simplified to him, and he was even able to see himself in a large, comprehensive way unencumbered by detail. It is remarkable in this portrait what little emphasis is put upon any particular part. It is not composed or forced or exaggerated in any way. It is a plain statement of the large truths of the physical presence. It has some nobility of mien, some characterisation of the old man in the painter, a little colour, less sharp light, and a great half-tone in which the head and bust are submerged. It is distinctly fine. Of course it has hardly the energy of his earlier portrait at Berlin but in other ways it seems larger, nobler, more universally true.

408. ——***Portrait of Alphonso I, Duke of Ferrara.*** The figure is rather badly disposed on the canvas. The top of the head now touches the picture-frame and the bottom of the canvas is over-filled by the spreading costume and the presence of the disturbing dog. The colour scheme is not pleasant and, to add to this feeling, the picture has suffered much from repainting. The face is now soft, weak in modelling, and the right hand is almost ruined. Originally it was probably an official court portrait done for the admiration of the Duke's posterity rather than for art's sake.

409. ** ——***Emperor Charles V with Dog.*** A full-length of the Emperor with the figure standing easily, though showing a little thin in the white-stockinged legs. It is probably the most exact portrait of the man that we have and yet contains much of the Emperor and the master. It is a strong, serious face, pallid in the flesh, protrusive in the lower jaw, with nose and brows a little hard. The imperial

costume, of course, lends itself to portraiture, and Titian made the most of it. The portrait is quite perfect in its quiet, simple statement of fact. The background has a handsome dark-green curtain at the left. The dog is rather wooden and is no match for the dogs of Velasquez. All told it is an excellent portrait—one of the noblest "portraits of parade" known to art. As an official performance Titian never bettered it except, perhaps, in the portrait of the Emperor at Mühlberg (No. 410).

410. *** ——***Charles V at Mühlberg.*** This is the famous equestrian portrait of Charles V, and a fine work it is in spite of the fact that it has been much restored and repainted. The spirit of it is capital and the simplicity of it little short of astonishing. Titian never proved his title to being the world's great painter better than in this superb portrait. What a monarch he here shows us! How resolute the face and attitude! How well he rides! How firmly he sits in the saddle! Titian put a great deal of push and drive in the horse and figure by making the horse rear a little and supporting that attitude by the long, diagonal lance. That gave motion while the upright line of the Emperor's figure gave dignity even in rapid action. The Emperor is alone, with no disturbing attendants or accessory objects or soldiers in the distance—alone in a superb, far-reaching landscape than which nothing could be more appropriate or better for the importance of the man and horse. The colour is presumably an attempt to match the original palette of Titian, and also the painting of the armour and trappings have something of Titian still in them, though the whole picture has been gone over by alien hands. It was

much injured in the fire of 1734 and required repainting.

411. ** ——*Portrait of Philip II.* A full-length portrait in armour standing in front of a table covered with a red cloth. The table is beautifully drawn, and the cloth is really exquisite in hue as in texture, but as a background it seems to push the figure too far forward—crowds it into the footlights, as it were. It is a noble portrait, nevertheless. The king is a rather odd-looking person, proud, haughty, thoroughly imbued with the imperial tradition, and no doubt disagreeable to meet in the life, but a personality for all that. The face is pale, the eyes dull, the lower jaw protrusive. There is, perhaps, too much magnificence in the armour, but Titian has tried to keep it in abeyance to the man. Also the white stockings and shoes are a little "jumpy," being (now) higher in value than the face and hands. A noble portrait though not, of course, so perfect a performance as the Paul III at Naples. Overcleaned like the other Titian portraits here. There are other versions of it at Naples and elsewhere.

412. ——*Portrait of a Knight of Malta.* It is in too bad condition to hang on the line or to talk about, or even to look at. With so many good Titians here to choose from, this one can be passed in silence.

413. ——*Portrait of a Man.* There is some good drawing in the eyes and forehead. The nose is, perhaps, a little sharp in outline. It is rather a strong head and shows a forceful character. The white fur may be a bit obtrusive. As for colour, aside from the flesh it is little more than a study in black and white.

414. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** It may be genuine enough but is not interesting in the subject or its treatment.

415. * ——***Portrait of the Empress Isabella.*** A very dignified portrait, full of seriousness and nobility for all the youth of the sitter. Originally it must have been done in Titian's most elaborate official style but is now much injured by repainting. The colour scheme is still delightful in dull reds and maroons. The dress is elaborate in pearls and embroidery, but these are kept down in light so that they do not seem to detract from the figure. The head is harmed by being placed against a now raw, repainted ground, and the left hand and arm were, perhaps, always questionable. The face is pallid, the eyes a little askew, the hands very patrician, the landscape excellent. The portrait was not painted from life but from another picture, which may account for some of the elaborateness of the dress and the unreality of the pose.

417. ——***The Marquis of Vasto Addressing His Soldiers.*** A genuine Titian but not an interesting one. It is a little perfunctory, something of an official report, perhaps. The crowd of soldiers at the back is well given, but the figures in the foreground do not join on very well to those in the background. The composition is awkward, with the hands and halberds cutting across the upper space, and the soldier in front in maroon-coloured coat and mail seems more important than the Marquis. But Titian is not now wholly responsible for the look of the picture. It has been wrecked by fire and repainting.

418. ** ——***The Bacchanal.*** An early Titian, probably belonging to the time of the Ariadne and Bacchus

in the National Gallery, London. It has been cleaned too much and is now airless, with a crude sky and clouds against which the trees cut sharply. The figures, too, have suffered somewhat but are still fine, especially the famous sleeping nude in the right-hand corner, now a little precise in outline. The two dancing figures at the right, the reclining woman in the centre, the brown-skinned figures about them acting as a foil to their light flesh-notes all have what is supposed to be a Giorgionesque quality about them. The grouping is excellent in its animation, its infinite variety, and, above all, in its wonderful unity. The whole throng is beautifully knit together and yet not constrained. The movement is as full of abandon as the spirit is of riotous joy. The colour is raw in spots where there has been too much cleaning and repainting. and it is now a little cool in the blues of the sea and sky; but, in spite of all, what marvellous colour it still shows us! A ship with set sails is seen at the back, and a river of wine was once apparent in the foreground but is now blurred by patching and cleaning. A companion piece to No. 419 though perhaps now a less beautiful work because of its bad condition.

419. *** ——***The Worship of Venus.*** A more pleasing picture than the Bacchanal (No. 418). It was a quaint conceit of Titian's to place that concourse of cupids in that beautiful landscape. Evidently the theme pleased him, for he spent much time varying the attitudes, movements, and types of the cupids. How various they are! It is worth a study for this great variety quite independent of other beauties in the picture. How wonderfully he has drawn and painted each one of the little

nude figures! What a group he has made of them! And what beautiful colour as well as line they reveal! Nothing could be more charming or more lovely. The two figures of women at the right support the statue of Venus but otherwise are hardly necessary in the picture except as they lend notes of colour. What triumphant colour in the foreground, wrung from the fruit, the scattered cloths, the grass and flowers, the blue-winged cupids! This colour is repeated at the top of the canvas in the flying cupids, the green foliage, and the blue sky seen through the trees. Finally, what a superb landscape! It is not airless as in No. 418, nor with crude sky and sharply outlined trees, but broader, freer, fuller of colour, more atmospheric, more beautiful in light. The picture is a magnificent Titian. It has been cleaned some and repainted in the head, neck, and arm of the woman with the mirror, in the statue, in the sky in spots here and there, but is still a wonderful work. Elsewhere regret has been expressed that Titian ever gave time to other work than portraiture; but here we recant. Such work as this could never be spared. It is too exquisite, too wonderful.

420. ——***Reclining Venus.*** This is a repetition of a theme familiar to Titian, he having put forth at least one other version now in the Uffizi at Florence. The type of the Venus, both here and there, is animal-like, decidedly earthy, but rather impressive in pure physical beauty. The underline of this Madrid Venus has something of a sweep and reveals something of bulk and weight, but is lacking in the charming variety of the nude figure in the Sacred and Profane Love in the Borghese Gallery, Rome. The figure is fleshy, heavy, lumpy.

The upper part of it is quite right, but the head is out of value. The velvet drapery under the figure is rather pronounced in its high lights; the curtain at the top is better. The landscape is very good. Injured by the fire of 1734 in common with so many of the Prado pictures, and much restored, but it was never a Titian masterpiece.

421. ——***Venus and Cupid.*** It is some sort of a school copy of No. 420 with variations taken from the Titian Venus of the Uffizi and elsewhere. Distinctly of an inferior quality to No. 420, the note of red in the curtain being out of key and the darker velvet under the figure less harmonious. Notice also that the landscape is more rudimentary. Much injured by fire and restoration.

422. ——***Venus and Adonis.*** This is another version of a familiar picture in the National Gallery, London. Apparently it is not by Titian's hand but is possibly by some one in his workshop. The work is crude in the dogs, the sky, the distant cupid under the tree, the trees themselves. The figures are as wanting in Titianesque quality as those in the London picture, yet this is supposed to be the original of the London picture. Neither of them is by Titian. The back of the Venus here is much discoloured as though repainted. The whole picture is suggestive of the restorer's art.

425. ** ——***Danae.*** At one time, no doubt, this was a wonderful nude, comparable, perhaps, to Giorgione's Venus at Dresden, but it has been damaged considerably by cleaning and repainting. The splendid figure remains, but the marks of the restorer spot it here and there. The right breast has been destroyed, the torso is marred in the model-

ling and discoloured, the right leg above the knee is now sharp in outline, the left leg is false in value, the right arm is heavy, the left arm feeble. And what are we to think of such things as the want of drawing in the cushions, the ropiness or painty quality of the linen under the figure? These are things that Titian could hardly have done deliberately, though he may have done them through carelessness. This is a late picture, and Titian in his late work omitted much, handled loosely, often kneaded and fumbled the surface, but he did not usually blotch and spot and omit good drawing. Besides, the careful doing of the curtain at the left, and of the old woman at the right do not agree with the shortcomings of the nude figure. The colour is still superb, and of course the picture is a notable one. It has the tang of beauty and at one time must have been a glorious affair. In conception it is neither delicate nor refined, but as form and colour it is still something of a marvel. There are many versions of it in European galleries, the earliest, perhaps, and the best preserved at Naples. This version was done for Philip II.

426. ——***Sisyphus.*** It is a companion piece to the Prometheus hanging opposite to it though it is less volcanic in its action and composition. The huge, straining figure is well drawn but the picture is not good in colour nor otherwise attractive. The colour is hot and now darkened, probably by fire and smoke. Both pictures were done to order to fill space. They are late works and much injured.

427. ——***Prometheus.*** The figure is ponderous and perhaps agonised too much. The handling is broad but coarse and the flesh colour is now black-

ened. Painted to order with three other pictures, one of them the Sisyphus (No. 426) and all of them rather perfunctory in their doing.

428. * ——***Salome.*** A repetition of the Titian's Daughter picture at Berlin (No. 166) save that she holds aloft the head of the Baptist on a charger here instead of a dish of fruit there. The colour scheme also is different. This is the more brilliant picture of the two. Seen from across the room, it is fine in pose and lovely in colour. It has been hurt by cleaning and repainting but is still very firm in the head, hair, neck, and shoulders, in the white veiling falling from the neck, the rich dress with its shadowed depth of hue and effective high lights. Was there a ribbon or jewelled collar about the throat at one time which is now painted out but leaves a mark on the canvas? The hands and arms with most of the head are in bad condition.

429. * ——***The Fall of Man.*** Colossal figures of Adam and Eve, the latter receiving the apple from the serpent with a child's head. The Eve is large and fine, the Adam more academic and less satisfactory. Both figures are remarkable for the broader and more universal truths of the human figure, whereas the fig-tree at the left, the peach-tree at the right, the hollyhocks below are marked by peculiar and special truth of characterisation. In the distance is a blue mountain landscape suggestive of the Cadore country where Titian was born. Late work and damaged by fire and repainting. See the Rubens copy (No. 1692) in this gallery.

430. ——***Religion Succoured by Spain.*** The figure with the spear is a little theatrical, and Religion is a poor, spiritless soul. The trappings of war in the fore-

ground are better done. It is not a remarkable Titian and probably he did little upon it that shows at present.

431. ——***Philip II Offering His Son to Heaven.*** A somewhat strained allegory (symbolising the victory of Lepanto) which Titian himself could not have enjoyed particularly. The angel is wrenched out of drawing and looks as though thrown out of a window rather than descending from the skies. The litter of Turkish plunder in the foreground, with a fighting fleet at the back, does not add much to the composition. It is doubtful if this picture was ever more than a workshop affair and it is now almost ruined by fire and repainting.

432. * ——***The Holy Trinity (La Gloria).*** A large oval of figures filling an upright panel, with considerable movement in the figures. Charles V, Philip II, and their wives are at the upper right while Moses, Noah, a Sibyl, and the (apparently) lesser immortals fill in the foreground lower down. The conceptions of the Father and Son are not startling. The Madonna in blue, looking back, is better. The Sibyl is the best of all. The colour is cool in blues. There is a fine suggestion of landscape at the bottom but not even Titian could make a satisfactory picture of such a composition. The surface is injured.

434. ** ——***Holy Family with St. Bridget and St. Ulfus.*** A beautiful picture in form and colour and, thanks to its being painted upon wood, in fair condition. The types are very lofty, noble, hardly of the earth, so elevated are they and so winning. St. Bridget also appears in the Sacred and Profane Love of the Borghese Gallery and St. Ulfus has not outgrown

a Bellinesque look and feeling. The colour is clear, brilliant, quite beautiful. The handling is devoid of much emendation, as, notice the flowers, and yet is not so positive and so sure as in the Tribute Money at Dresden (No. 169). There are indications, as in the hair of the Madonna, that an alien hand has been at work on the surface and left blotches here and there, but otherwise the picture is a clean, early Titian. Formerly attributed to Giorgione.

435. ——***Flight into Egypt.*** It does not suggest Titian, save vaguely, and was probably done by some inferior follower of the master. The figure and robe of Joseph, the Madonna, the hatchet-faced St. John with the ponderous hand and shoulder, the sheep, the donkey, the ducks, the landscape all show poor workmanship.

437. ——***Ecce Homo.*** It is a rather strong half-figure but it may be questioned if Titian did it. It is nearer to Bassano than to Titian. The hair and beard have blackened and most of the background has "bubbled" as though injured by bitumen. Painted on stone.

438. ——***Christ Bearing the Cross.*** The figure of Christ is slight and his face and hand are feminine. The cross bearing down upon the figure is enormous. The old man's head is the better of the two, but Titian probably did neither of them. It is more like pupil's work or a workshop piece.

439. ——***Christ Bearing the Cross.*** It has the signatures of Bellini and Titian upon it, but otherwise there is nothing about the picture to indicate that either painter had aught to do with it.

440. ** ——*The Entombment.* In its subject this picture inevitably brings up the famous Entombment of the Louvre, with the result that this Madrid picture suffers somewhat by the comparison. It is an arched composition and the group is well held together and strengthened by rounded, repeated lines. There is much action accumulated about the dead figure, some limp drag-down to the body of the Saviour, some strain about the bent form of the disciple in red which in its back line leads on to the left arm and shoulders of the Christ; but there is also some huddling of the figures, some want of space, some crowding of the Madonna, for instance. The best part of the picture is the nude figure of Christ and the disciple in red. Titian himself was probably not satisfied with it. It is not so freely done as some of his late works and was probably much changed and emended, for the surface is flaky, bready, mealy, and the drawing has been gone over more than once. Yet it has fine qualities about it. Look at it from across the gallery and get the largeness of the figures and the unity of the group. Executed in 1559.

442. ——*The Saviour.* Evidently a part of a picture and not very good at that. It is much repainted in the now crude sky and in the figure. The face is prettified and the hand is ruined. Apparently it never came from Titian's brush; at least there is now little sign of Titian about it.

443. ——*The Virgin of Sorrows.* This will hardly pass for a Titian though a good enough picture in itself. One hardly knows where to place it.

444. ——*The Virgin of Sorrows.* It is possibly by some Titian pupil or follower. The left hand is awkward,

the nose and brows hard in line, the blue robe sharp in hue. The whole face has been scrubbed and repainted, also the hands. On stone.

445. ** ——*St. Margaret.* A fine Titian as regards both the figure and the landscape though, unfortunately, both have darkened by time—so much so that the right leg of the saint has almost disappeared and the sea and sky have become blackish. But the figure is still superb in bulk, body, and action, with a well-turned head and well-rounded arms. The colour is dark again but wonderfully harmonious. As for the dragon, he is only to be guessed at; but the sea with its sombre shadow is now grandly mysterious and the whole landscape is a wonder of breadth and force. The upper part of the canvas was, perhaps, added after Titian's death. A late picture and an excellent one.

448. ——*St. Jerome.* The catalogue suggests that this picture is by Lotto—a suggestion that meets with acceptance in many quarters. The angel, the blue sky, the red robe are distinctly Lottesque. But it is not a very important picture.

1159. **Tristan, Luis.** *St. Anthony.* Rather hard and brutal but with some strength in it—that is, so far as one may see. The picture is badly hung. And the attribution seems more than half doubtful, seen from a distance.

525 } **Umbrian School.** ***Continence of Scipio and Rape***
524 } ***of the Sabines.*** These are decorative panels, probably done for a wedding-chest, and possibly they came from some Umbrian workshop—the catalogue suggests Pinturicchio's, and Berenson Aspertini's. They are rich in colour. The landscape has gilded high lights.

1858 } **Veen, Otto van (Vænius).** ***Saints and Donors.***
1859 } Two panels from an altar-piece that show the style of painting started by Van Veen in the School of Antwerp and brought to perfection by Rubens.

1168. * **Velasquez, Diego de Silva y.** ***Coronation of the Virgin.*** The face of the Madonna is attractive, the figure dignified, and her robe well done, but if we had nothing of Velasquez but this rather strained composition to judge by we should not marvel over his skill or place him with the immortals. It is one of his least interesting works. There are other works of his here of more merit, though in itself this is not wanting in skill or beauty. The figures at the top are the poorest part of the picture. They are not so believable as the Madonna. As for the colour scheme, it was, perhaps, something of an experiment but not a wholly unsuccessful one.

1166. ——***Adoration of Kings.*** In the early style of Velasquez, done when he was about twenty. The Velasquez of fame is not so much as indicated here. He had not found himself at this time and was evidently following the example of his older Spanish contemporaries and masters, Herrera and Pacheco. The drawing is hard and the shadows are blackish, though there is good work in the kneeling figure at the left, in the Madonna holding the very natural Child, and in the draperies. A painter of some power is already apparent but not the painter of Las Meninas.

1209. ——***Head of a Man.*** This was done, no doubt, with great exactness and fidelity to the model but is, nevertheless, sharp in line, hard in modelling, and leathery in textures. It has a look of Il Greco

mixed with Ribalta. It is in the early style of Velasquez, done at a time when he was probably regarding his contemporaries with more admiration than later on.

1182. * ——***Philip IV.*** This is, perhaps, the first attempt to paint Philip, judging from the king's age. It is a commanding full-length, of much power and beauty, in which Velasquez shows that though young he already has an independent mind, eye, and hand. The picture has not the ease of drawing, the loose handling, the light, air, colour, ensemble of his later time, but there are profound knowledge and observation in it. The king stands well and is placed well on the canvas but perhaps comes forward a little too much, though the room seems not wanting in atmosphere. The whole—the figure and the interior—is seen and handled simply, directly, without attempt at colour splendour or great decorative effect. The painter was to do the king as he was—no more. Still, in the drawing of the fine figure with the slim legs and the dignified court costume, how beautifully he handled the blacks! What a fine grey he got in the ground! What a good red in the table-cloth! The figure is, perhaps, more satisfactory than the head. The latter seems less effective than in the smaller version (No. 1183) though there is not much difference between them. The hands have been hurt somewhat.

1183. * ——***Philip IV.*** It is difficult to determine whether this head preceded or followed the head in No. 1182. It is possibly an original study. The colour helps it out decoratively and yet, perhaps, the armour was an afterthought painted by Velasquez some

years after the head. The head is harder in drawing than the bust. The king appears about eighteen or nineteen years of age and Velasquez was about twenty-four.

1188. ** ——***Portrait of the Infante Don Carlos.*** This portrait shows a brother of Philip IV who died in 1632. It is comparable to the full-length of the king (No. 1182) but in many ways is a more satisfactory picture. The subject is a stronger, more sturdy character, seems more firm in body, and stands better. How well he stands and how positive he looks! Notice, too, that he stands within the frame, a little farther back than the king (No. 1182), and that the room with its atmosphere seems more apparent. The figure, again, is more graceful, more commanding in its courtly elegance. And what a beautiful costume this is! The blacks are shrewdly varied, the gold chain lends a little relief of colour, and the gloves and hair repeat this colour note. This is certainly a very beautiful early Velasquez. The painter's later style is, perhaps, to be preferred, but such work as this must command a mighty respect. To be sure, it is still hard in drawing though a little later than No. 1182, rather cool in colour, and with a plain grey ground. But it has skill, power, point of view, simplicity, reserve—almost all the great qualities of his later work.

1187. * ——***Portrait of Doña Maria, Queen of Hungary.*** This is evidently a later portrait than No. 1188, for it is done in a looser, freer style, as one may see by examining the hair and costume; but the doing of the face is not very different from that of the early Philip near it (No. 1183). The brush is dry

and not very colourful. A fine head, however. The lady was a sister of Philip IV and considered a great beauty in her day. She appears here about twenty-five years of age.

1170. ** ——*Bacchus* (*Los Borrachos*). The picture was painted before Velasquez made his first trip to Italy and is reminiscent of the Spanish art of, say, Ribalta, Pacheco, and one knows not who else; but under it one feels the power of the still undeveloped Velasquez. He was thirty when he painted this and was still growing in strength, ease, skill, taste. The half-nude Bacchus calls for much applause but the group of four to the right is just as fine. They are Spanish peasant types done with a hard, positive truth that is impressive. What heads they have! And what expressive faces! Look at the savage holding the bowl of wine. And look, too, at the bowl. See also the still-life on the ground. The lumpy, fat Bacchus or the satyr at the left is in the same vein of broad realism as the still-life. Truth and its technical rendering make up the picture more than any imaginings about classic myth or Bacchic legend. The picture has darkened some by time and is stained in the sky, though it was probably always dark in tone. The lighting, the tone, the atmosphere of this picture are inadequate, insufficient, undeveloped for Velasquez, as we shall see further on.

1171. ** ——*The Forge of Vulcan.* Painted during the first visit of Velasquez in Rome and done in a looser and freer style than the Bacchus. There is no loss of modelling in the figures but they are easier in handling and show less surface hardness. How beautifully they are drawn! How they stand

aghast at the story told by Apollo! What backs and legs and heads! What forges, armour, and hammers! Look at the little white jug on the shelf. If people want realism of the fact, why, here it is—realism of texture and surface as well as drawing and modelling. The little Apollo with his sharp profile is the poorest part of the picture. How badly his robe is done compared with the clout of the man with his back to us! The light here is not so artificial as in the Bacchus. There is more diffusion, more of an attempt at open-air light, the shadows are not so hard and black, and there is more atmosphere. The canvas is pieced out at both sides. It seems to have been a Velasquez failing not to know how much space his figures would require until he saw them on the canvas. A fine—a very fine picture.

1178. ** ——*Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV.* The age of the king indicates the period when the portrait was painted. It is looser in handling than No. 1171 and perhaps a little more careless in spots, as in the ornament on the hat, or the flying sash, or the cuff above the glove. The bulk of the figure is well given and the figure sits the horse fairly well, though Velasquez was not satisfied with the first drawing of it. It was put in and afterward changed, as one may still see by the half-obliterated paint about the chest and back line—the half-obliterated part of it being peculiarly fetching to modern artists and leading on to much senseless imitation. So, too, with the horse. There are two extra hind legs still to be made out. Besides, the canvas has been pieced out on both sides, at the left-hand lower corner, and somewhat altered elsewhere. There was difficulty experienced with it, but it was finally

overcome. As a total result the king rides well, rides gracefully, rides like a king. What a well-knit combination of horse and man! What a wonderful statue in bronze it would make! The lines are really more sculpturesque than picturesque but superb, nevertheless. The lighting is a little uncertain, a mixture of sunlight and studio light, and the landscape is merely an effective background helping out the colour scheme. The colour is clear, devoid of blackness, highly decorative. Velasquez learned something about that in Italy—learned much about colour, light, handling, style—yet it is not possible to trace in his work the influence of any one Italian painter or even one Italian school of painting. He absorbed and assimilated everywhere but imitated no painter, no particular style. He had his own point of view and clung to it, seeing nature in his own large way and painting her in his own large manner.

1181. ——***Equestrian Portrait of the Duke of Olivares.*** ** A portrait of about the same quality as the Philip (No. 1178). One may have his preferences and think, perhaps, the Olivares the better in the big body of both man and horse. In some respects it seems surer in the doing, less careless, or perhaps we should say less experimental, as though the painter knew better what he wanted to do and did it better. The horse is a fine beast and with the rider cuts something of a figure considering that neither of them cut any such figure in the life. The Count was never under fire and the battle at the back is wholly imaginary with the painter. But the battle and the landscape make up a mere background for the figure, as in the case of the equestrian Philip. Neither of these groups fits in the landscape quite

as it should. Each stands out too much. See in the Breda picture (No. 1172) how much better Velasquez has made his groups stand in, or, as a supreme example of this, see Las Meninas (No. 1174). Still, the Olivares and the Philip are wonderful performances, the Olivares excelling in bulk and weight, the Philip in graceful line and refined colour.

1208. ——***The God Mars.*** It is an academic affair, rather formal in arrangement and not entrancing in colour. As an embodiment of war Velasquez may have had certain ideas about it, but as Greek tradition it is not profound. Perhaps a Mars with a moustache may cause the flippant to smile, but that is not the way to look at the picture. It is a very good piece of drawing and painting, and as such is worthy of study; as for the handling, it is loose and free but sure and true in every stroke. The colouring is a little warm. It is not to be regarded as a profound expression of thought or feeling.

1210 } ——***The Villa Medici, Rome.*** These are interesting
1211 } studies of landscape, showing the eye and hand of the painter turned from figures a moment to sketch the nature about him in Rome. The key of colour is in silver greys and greens. This should be remembered, for in his later pictures this key was continued by Velasquez. The black-shadowed, brown-hued affairs so often set down to him may be put down as largely belonging to his following. At first Velasquez himself painted in browns and dark greys but not frequently after his first visit to Italy.

1201 } ——***Portraits of Dwarfs.*** Of these dwarf portraits
1202 } perhaps the No. 1204 is the most interesting in
1204 } painting, the head being superb in the manner of
1205 } its doing. The head in No. 1205 is also excellent
* but the ruff and cuff have been sketchily added. Notice the still-life in No. 1201 and again the excellent head. These dwarfs seem of small importance in this great roomful of splendid pictures by Velasquez, but in reality they too are splendidly seen and executed.

1198. ——***Pablillos de Valladolid.*** This is one of the
* most carefully done of the early Velasquezes, its care and its colour scheme suggesting early work but its handling seemingly placing it after his first Italian journey. How well drawn and well painted it is in head and dress and figure! The movement of the figure, the gesture, is rather unique among the portraits of Velasquez. He is usually given to painting the sitter in repose—even frankly and formally posing the sitter for a portrait and with no pretence of anything else than a frank pose. The background apparently has suffered in some way and seems to have been repainted.

1180. ——***Equestrian Portrait of Prince Baltasar Carlos.***
** A charming child's portrait showing, perhaps, a childish consciousness of royalty but with a superb little air of distinction, indifference, even haughtiness. The face is a little pallid, the hair and hat just a little mauled by the brush, the dress beautifully done, as also the head of the barrel-bellied pony. The pony's tail is, perhaps, unnecessarily painty. A very spirited picture with graceful lines and excellent movement. It is the most admired of the equestrian portraits not only for

its spirit and the characterisation of the little prince but for its fine, clear colour. The landscape is cold in its blues compared with No. 1189. Patched at the top and bottom and damaged by cleaning.

1200. * ——***Portrait of a Buffoon*** (***Don Juan of Austria***). Interesting as showing how Velasquez, late in his career, laid in his figures. This portrait was thinly rubbed in and perhaps never entirely completed. Look at the breeches or stockings, for example. Perhaps Velasquez liked it as it now is and did not wish to carry it further. The handling is easy, sure, direct, not repeated or fussed over. It looks carelessly done but is far from it. Every stroke was thought out, premeditated, and proved to be exactly and infallibly right. How the man leans forward! How his feet strike the ground! How the type and the character are given! And what a fine colour study of pinks and blacks into the bargain!

1172. *** ——***Surrender of Breda.*** The picture is sometimes called Las Lanzas. The formal composition —two oblongs at the left, one of sky and one of lower figures, and an upright of lances at the right —would have paralysed the mind and hand of an ordinary painter at the start. But what a picture Velasquez has made by and with this simple arrangement! He turned every bit of it to account in telling the tale of the surrender. The action turns on the central figures with the key of the city gate between them. The vista beyond and back of the key discloses the figures in the second plane. From these the hills roll into a ridge overlooking the distant background. There is a marked contrast between the groups at the left and at the right. The

upright bunched lances at the right suggest the order, precision, and command of the victorious Spaniards, while the wabbling halberds and pennants, the disorder and disarray at the left suggest the confusion of the conquered Netherlanders. Justin of Nassau, with his deferential bearing, presenting the key of the city, and Spinola, with his sympathetic protest, are superb in spirit and quite right in realisation. These two figures make the rounded or oval group in the centre that offsets and contrasts with the rigidity of the spears and the halberds. How accurately, carefully, beautifully as well as truthfully these figures are painted! Look at the Spinola armour, sash, hat, and boots or the costume of the humbled Justin of Nassau. They could not be bettered. And what a horse—how beautifully drawn and painted! Velasquez himself appears at the right of the horse's head. The colour is cool but fine, with no high, screaming notes. It is highly decorative and yet realistically true in the sense that it is seen under one light and is in perfect tone. The ensemble of it, the hold-together of it did not admit of any emphasis of any one note. Every tone and every shade was required to keep its place in the whole just as it would do in the natural scene. That is the gist of the painter's great realism—his great truth. The harmony is quite perfect. A world-famous canvas that deserves its fame. It was painted when Velasquez was forty-five. Somewhat injured above Spinola's head and elsewhere.

1195. ——***Portrait of Diego de Corral y Arellano.*** After looking at the Surrender of Breda picture this portrait, hanging next to it, seems a little too cramped in handling and wanting in freedom. It is done

with some precision, some truth, some force. The dress is well given, but is a little flat, and the head is not too sure in drawing. The picture seems official in quality and tells us very little of Velasquez. It has been repainted.

1167. * ——***The Crucified Christ.*** As a matter of religious sentiment or feeling it is negligible. Velasquez had no sentiment of that kind and never showed it in his pictures. As a nude figure it is delicate, refined in line as in colour, quite pure, and decidedly effective. The partial hiding of the face by the falling hair was doubtless designed to make the face mysterious and thereby appeal to the imagination of the spectator. The figure and also the wood of the cross stand out too much. They fail to recede though there is a suggestion of depth and gloom in the background. The picture hardly reveals the Velasquez of fame though it has been made famous by much praise—some of it justified, of course.

1196. ——***Portrait of Doña Antonia Ipeñarrieta y Galdos.*** This portrait shows a stern, sad-faced lady of rank in dark dress on a brown ground. The one colour note in it is the red chair which is a little violent and too prominent. The figure does not stand well and the aerial setting is not apparent nor is it felt. The child was an after-thought and probably added by some other painter than the one who painted the woman. Neither figure is too near to Velasquez. Much cleaned and retouched.

1184. * ——***Philip IV in Shooting Costume.*** This is the full-length in shooting garb done a few years later than the full-length in the National Gallery, London (No. 1129). It is very much surer and

truer, more exact in drawing and handling than the London picture, though Velasquez's style was broadening and loosening at the time he did it. The hair, coat, and glove are excellent. The doing of the sleeve and collar should be compared closely with the London picture, for here everything is exactly right as there almost everything is open to question as regards accuracy. The legs in this picture are a little disturbing owing to alterations and emendations without sufficient painting out of the first drawing. The larger outline of the left leg is still apparent and is a bit distracting. Also the gun-barrel and the landscape at the right of the hip have been changed and the underpainting insufficiently rubbed out. But it is a fine portrait. And with an excellent dog. See the note on the London full-length, which is almost surely by Mazo.

1186. ——***Don Ferdinand of Austria.*** This portrait is very like the Philip near it but, perhaps, is not so carefully done, though the head seems stronger and better than that of the Philip. One hardly knows which to admire the more, the man or the dog. The dog seems to have more character, more force for a dog than the Prince for a man, but he is, perhaps, overprominent in the picture. As a dog he cannot be matched in any other canvas in existence, being quite perfect in every respect. The portrait as a whole is, perhaps, more interesting than the Philip (No. 1184). It has been amended and changed somewhat by the painter. The first outline of the neck and shoulders has been carelessly rubbed out and the second drawing was put in smaller. There seems to have been trouble in fitting the head on the shoulders.

1189. * ——***Prince Baltasar Carlos in Shooting Costume.*** A fine child's head and with a figure that truly complements it. How well all of Velasquez's people stand on their feet! And how restfully they stand—even this little boy! Look at his little feet and legs—how positively right they are! The portrait was done at about the same time as the two portraits in hunting costume near it (Nos. 1184, 1186), though the handling of the dress appears just a trifle broader. The landscape is a bit chalky and the dogs are not so good as elsewhere—in Las Meninas, for instance. The canvas is pieced out at the top.

1174. *** ——***The Maids of Honour (Las Meninas).*** The scene represented is in a room in the palace occupied by the painter as a studio. Velasquez himself at the canvas is painting the portrait of the king and queen who are supposed to be in about the position of the spectator. The reflection of the king and queen is seen in a rather bright mirror on the wall at the end of the room. The king is supposed to have seen the Infanta with her maids in that position and suggested to the painter the pictorial possibilities of the scene; but of that we have no direct proof. At any rate, Velasquez was the mind, eye, and hand that put it together. It is done in his late style and is his most celebrated picture. As a piece of illusion (the very thing usually condemned in pictures) it is something astonishing. The canvas "breaks through the wall," as painters say. Seeing it from across the room, one feels as though he might walk into the canvas, so amazingly does it set in and run back from the frame. One gets the first surprise from the back of the huge canvas and stretcher at the left. This

to start with sets in from the picture-frame, and from it the eye immediately travels to the receding figures on the right of it and the painter (Velasquez) with palette and brushes back of it. Then comes the rear wall with its pictures, and back of that a still-receding passage with a figure on the steps leading out to a lighted court. At the right of the canvas one meets with the same linear and aerial perspective, taking him positively and remorselessly back into the picture. The eye picks up the huge dog (what a solid bulk of dog he is and how that little dwarf's foot pushes but fails to move him!) lying *in* from the picture-frame. Then comes the diagonal recession of the three figures, then the two figures in the middle distance, and then again that figure on the steps at the back. The right wall with its hanging pictures seen in perspective receding each in value helps on the illusion. And will you notice that the ceiling above does the same thing? The centre pieces of different values carry your eye back, and the raw edge of the wooden stretcher high up at the left is so absolutely true in value that you must feel the space and air between it and the back wall. It is all most amazing in its doing, and only one note raises a question or stirs a doubt. That is, the mirror on the rear wall reflecting the king and queen. It seems too high-keyed in light. Possibly it was put in that way to illumine the background but more probably to please the king.

Astonishing as this illusion is, it would hardly make Las Meninas either famous or great art without other excelling features. Nor would its almost perfect drawing and painting be sufficient to place it with the world's great masterpieces. In

these latter respects the picture is undoubtedly one of the best Velasquez ever did. The little Infanta in the centre, with her childish face and pretty hair, her hoop-skirt dress, and all that, is quite right in every way, as are also her attendant maids. Nothing could be finer in grouping or more infallible in placing. The handling is broad, free, effective, masterful. It is the very top notch of painting. But to all this illusion, skill, and mastery Velasquez also brought a sense of beauty and a decorative quality. How superb the whole thing is in colour, in light, in shadow, in air! What a beautiful harmony of varying hues are held together by the light and atmosphere of the room! And what lovely types of children—the attendant maids at left and right not less so than the Infanta herself! What a graceful attitude that of the maid at the left—the older one at the right being, perhaps, more conscious but still attractive! And the heavy, ugly dwarf placed next to the rather handsome little dwarf at the right and opposite the Infanta and her maids was not put there for mere truth's sake. As a type and as colour she is a foil and a contrast to the others. The painter at the left and the couple at the right balancing him are less noticeable. And, again, the dog—what a massive, powerful brute! And with what a massive, powerful touch he is painted! In varying degree, modulated here, flowing there, absolute everywhere, the whole picture is painted with the same powerful brush. Finally, go across the room and see how wonderfully the picture is held together. Its unity is supreme. It is all of a piece, and the eye sees it as a whole as the actual scene before one might have been. It is a very great picture—great

beyond words to tell. The Order of Santiago on the painter's coat lapel was put on after the death of Velasquez, and the pretty story of the king completing the picture by painting in the decoration with his own hand is a fiction. The picture has been hurt by cleaning.

1175. ——***Mercury and Argus.*** The form of the composition was dictated by the place in the Room of Mirrors for which it was painted. It is broadly and freely handled, considerably changed and amended about the hat and shoulders of the Mercury, pieced out at the top to give it space. The colour scheme is rather warm, and the whole effect decorative in the sense that one feels it belongs not here but in a panel of a room.

1203. ——***Portrait of a Dwarf of Philip IV.*** After studying the other pictures by Velasquez in this room and feeling that perhaps we know his accuracy and sureness of touch even in his broadest and freest manner, are we to believe that this rather ill-drawn and heavily painted picture is by him? Look at the thumbed head and hair, the badly drawn arms and coat, the ineffective pattern of the cloth, that tortured hat, the bad boots and feet, the wooden dog, and the floor that runs up but not back. It may be a hastily prepared sketch, but it has the look of a careless school piece.

1173. *** ——***The Tapestry Weavers.*** This picture should be studied from across the room to get the ensemble of it. It is not so perfect an illusion as Las Meninas, but it is something similar as regards its realism and its composition. The recession of the figures into the picture is once more wonderfully given.

The red curtain at the left is used here as a catch point for the eye instead of the canvas and stretcher as in Las Meninas. The figure back of it, the ladder against the wall, the recess with more figures, and back of them a tapestry stretched upon the wall are all inconspicuous catch points of colour or of light whereby the eye is led into the background. The same recession takes place upon the right side, with the figures, the door, the wall, the recess at the back. The walls and ceiling do not help out so much here as the receding floor and the flight of steps. Nor is the aerial effect so pronounced as in Las Meninas. Instead of that Velasquez has relied more upon a repetition of planes in light and dark. The light figures in the foreground are followed by a dark wall, which in turn is followed by a light recess and still again by a well-lighted tapestry at the back. It is all very cunningly and shrewdly done but perhaps more laboured and less effectively carried out than the plan of Las Meninas.

But here again Velasquez has not relied upon illusion or mere skill or the actuality of the scene to carry his picture. Once more we have a decorative scheme of bright colour, with light, air, and luminous shadow. It is less wonderful, less harmonious, less refined than Las Meninas; but we need not grumble about it. By itself considered it is very fine—a masterpiece in fact. For there is here again the sense of beauty not only in the lovely small figures, the beautiful colour, and the charming light and air of that recess at the back but in the arm, head, neck, and hair of that wonderful figure in blue at the right, in her companion to the extreme right, in the old woman at the spindle or the young woman by the curtain. The figure in blue is the

central light of the picture and the most beautiful object in it.

A famous picture and again worthy of its fame even if not so extraordinary as Las Meninas. It is, unfortunately, in bad condition. The central seated figure in red is blurred in the face, and the woman at the wheel has darkened. There has been much restoration. The canvas is patched at the top and sides. The painter's feeling for space was always calling for more canvas.

1206. * ——***Æsop.*** This is merely an old bull-fighter, crippled in the legs and feet, posing as a philosopher. As a matter of battered physical presence, of bone and muscle and bulk, he is really superb though not of noble strain. Look at the modelling of the rather brutal face and head, the wonderful drawing of the eyes, the modelling of the cheek-bones and the flattened nose. They are perfect. The face is pallid, and the hair is now disturbing because too chalky and perhaps a little out of value. As colour the picture counts for little, but as a presentation of a figure standing in a given space, a piece of work freely and easily done, with that perfect mastery that finally came to Velasquez, it is a noteworthy example. The brush-work here seems even to boast its combined accuracy and freedom.

1185. * ——***Bust Portrait of Philip IV.*** It is not so satisfactory as a similar head, done about the same time or a little later, in the National Gallery, London (No. 745). The dress here is simply painted and with a few strokes. The hair, forehead, and eyes are excellent, as also the mouth. The cheek-bones seem to have lost some of their modelling owing to much rubbing. It is more

sketchy than the London portrait but is, after its kind, just as true. A fine portrait.

1193. ——***Portrait of the Count of Benavente.*** With its dark curtain, its elaborate armour, its smooth face, careful hair and beard, shoe-button eyes, pinched nose and mouth, it seems to contradict every other Velasquez in the room. It is a rather good portrait, but is it by Velasquez? It does not look it. How the table pushes the man out against the picture-frame! It is much repainted, which may account for its failure to correspond with other works by Velasquez, though it seems to be more in the style of Mazo.

1207. * ——***Menippus.*** A companion panel to the Æsop but of a better quality, with truer light and more agreeable colour. An old beggar again posing as a sage, with some remarkable painting in the head and cloak, and a superb poise and placing of the figure. How absolutely true that posture, that bend, that turn of the head! Look at the jug painted in shadow. Again, how absolute it is! Velasquez is always offering small surprises of this kind.

1194. * ——***Montanes the Sculptor.*** With some fine drawing in the eyes and cheeks and a well-modelled forehead. The figure, too, has weight and thickness. Is the little white whisker on the chin perhaps too high in light? It seems to be pasted on the chin rather than grown there. The sculpture at the right is merely suggested, not finished. A fine portrait of the painter's second or middle period.

1169. ——***St. Anthony, Abbot, and St. Paul.*** The most remarkable thing about this picture is the over-

accented raven with the bread. Both the raven and bread are so false in value that they come forward, even outside of the picture-frame. There is not too much certainty about either the figures or the landscape being by Velasquez. The hands alone would seem to warrant emphatic doubts. The canvas has been added to at the top and corners, but that does not make it a Velasquez.

1190. * ——***Doña Mariana of Austria.*** The figure here was placed on too small a canvas to start with. The canvas was insufficient at the sides and was pieced out at the top, where a badly painted curtain has been rubbed in, perhaps by some later hand than that of Velasquez. The whole of the curtain is bad, the chair is not much better, and only the wall, the clock, and the table keep their places. Even the figure comes forward a little too much. The head with its wig seems well enough done and was doubtless painted by Velasquez. The dress, on the contrary, with the table, chair, and clock, seem like pupil's work. The whole of it is much coarser, less delicate, less refined than the work in the Maria Teresa of Austria (No. 1192), painted a little later. Start the comparison between the two pictures by noting the difference in the handkerchiefs held by each character or the difference in light, shade, and air shown in the backgrounds.

1191. ——***Doña Mariana of Austria.*** This portrait hangs in the long gallery, and from its dark placing it is impossible to form a judgment as to whether it is a replica or a copy of No. 1190. It is of the same general character.

1192. ** ——***Doña Maria Teresa of Austria.*** It is probably a portrait of the Infanta Margarita. It is another

illustration (common enough in this room) of a figure being originally placed on too small a canvas. The canvas here has been added to at the sides (or else it was once framed down too close) with results that now show badly and are unhappy. The curtain, screen, and chair make a shadowed atmospheric setting of much beauty, and the figure placed against them yet in the atmosphere with them, is, perhaps, the most brilliant piece of Velasquez colouring in the Prado. Aside from any question of characterisation in the sitter, the dress, with its notes of red, silver, and warm white, is a most charming harmony—a flash of court splendour that is almost dazzling. All sorts of delicate tones are woven into this fabric. Notice the mauve slashings on the sleeves or the indefinite blue shadows of the stuffs at the wrists. All this dress part is done with great delicacy of touch as well as of tone. Look at the transparent quality of the handkerchief or the sheen of the red dress under it or again the fluffy sleeves. The head is disappointing. The eyelids show badly, the nose is putty-like, the shadow under the chin is not delicate enough, and the throat is not drawn enough or else it has been rubbed too much. As for the hair, the high lights upon it are too prominent and not well placed, while the surface texture is wanting. It looks like hemp, whereas it is crimped hair. Compare it with the hair of the Infanta in Las Meninas or even with that of the Philip in No. 1185. It looks very much as though some restorer had worked over the face and hair to their great injury. In these Madrid portraits of the Infantas we must keep in mind the superb ones in Vienna (No. 621) and the Louvre (No. 1731).

Great painters, of course, nod at times, like other people, but they do not blunder so badly as this head would indicate. See the notes on the Vienna portraits of Velasquez.

1177. ——***Equestrian Portrait of Doña Margarita of Austria.*** The horse and background are painted by one hand and the figure of the queen by another hand. The horse is decidedly good and possibly by Velasquez. The queen's portrait is not his work. The canvas is added to at the sides.

1176. ——***Equestrian Portrait of Philip III.*** Two different hands were originally at work upon this picture, and a third hand (that of the restorer) has made still further confusion. The result is unsatisfactory. Velasquez is only to be guessed at in the accessories and costume, not in the face. The canvas is added to at the sides.

1179. ——***Equestrian Portrait of Queen Isabella of Bourbon.*** It is similar to No. 1177 in that two hands are apparent in the work—the queen and her costume by one, the horse and landscape by the other. The horse is very good and probably by some pupil of Velasquez. The canvas is added to at the sides and repainted in the background.

1199. ——***Portrait of Pernia.*** A very good start for a picture. It is well laid in but was never finished. It is probably by some pupil of Velasquez.

1224. ——***Portrait of an Unknown Man.*** It is "attributed" to Velasquez in the catalogue and certainly looks like that painter's early method and manner but is, nevertheless, probably by one of his pupils. A very good head though somewhat ill drawn.

484. **Veronese, Paolo Caliari.** ***Portrait of a Lady.*** The lady has no back to her head, among other shortcomings. It is not believable that Paolo did this portrait or No. 486 though done after his manner and method of portraiture.

486. ——***Portrait of a Lady.*** A bit coarse and perfunctory in the doing of it though of the same general character as No. 484. The picture is attractive on account of the colour and the personal beauty of the sitter. It is by some follower of Paolo.

482. ——***Venus and Adonis.*** This is one of the pictures bought in Venice by Velasquez for the collection of Philip IV, and it was a very good purchase, though there may be doubts about its being a Paolo. The Venus is imposing and much the Paolo type, the Adonis is lumpy, the Cupid is Paolo-like again, but the dogs are not his at all, and the landscape is decidedly too crude for him. The surface will not answer for Paolo either. There is something too flat and smooth about it. The picture lacks in quality, in spirit, in inspiration.

483. ——***Susanna.*** The slightness of the figures, the drawing, the colour, the handling, the landscape of this picture, all point to the school or the workshop. This statement is equally true of Nos. 494 and 499. The Madrid Gallery people perhaps accept the superficial appearance too readily in these attributions. Paolo's family and pupils were responsible for much of the work given to him in this gallery and elsewhere.

491. ——***Christ Disputing with the Doctors.*** A large canvas emanating from Paolo's workshop, perhaps. There is small indication of his hand in the work.

The colour is very good, but the figures are commonplace, and there is want of artistic feeling in the picture. Notice the prosaic type of the boy Christ or the heavy groups at the right and left.

492. * ——***Christ and the Centurion.*** The sky has changed in colour, and the background of architecture no longer keeps its place. The result is that the figures in the foreground are pushed too far forward. That is, perhaps, not a fault in a decorative composition, though possibly Paolo did not intend any such effect. The kneeling figure and the soldiers back of the figure are excellent. The figure of Christ is weaker, more effeminate, less forceful. The colour is good. Not a great picture nor a fine example of Paolo, but the best one here. Perhaps pupils worked upon it in places.

497. ——***Martyrdom of a Saint.*** If compared with the genuine Paolo, No. 492, hanging near it this picture will be found wanting in many respects. It belongs to Paolo's school, not to the master himself, though it has some good painting in it.

498. ——***The Magdalen.*** The picture has darkened much and is now hung too high for any one to see it properly, but the largeness of the figure, the drapery, and the hands rather suggest Paolo as the author of it. It looks much repainted.

500. ——***Sacrifice of Abraham.*** A Veronese school piece of no great value.

501. ——***Cain.*** This picture seems more closely related to Padovanino than to Paolo Veronese. It is not an important work.

502. * ——***Moses Saved from the Nile.*** A sketchy and very charming picture that is good enough for Pa-

olo but seems not strongly characteristic of him, though he probably did it. The colour is excellent and the landscape rather fine. The glass over the picture improves its tonal effect and perhaps gives a false impression.

511. **Volterra, Daniele (Ricciarelli) da.** ***Calvary.*** A good illustration of the mannered and exaggerated art which followed Michelangelo and for which he was largely responsible. Everybody and everything here is posed or twisted or somehow made to exhibit a straight line breaking a flowing line. The composition is restless, overloaded, and the colours used include everything on the Florentine palette of the time.

1887. * **Weyden, Roger van der.** ***Marriage of the Virgin.*** A picture perhaps originally designed as a diptych but not well related, panel to panel, because in slightly different keys of colour and light. The drawing is somewhat hard and awkward, the grouping rather bad, the values not particularly well maintained, the colours beautiful in themselves but not subtle or delicate. The picture has hardly the passion or the power that we expect from Roger, and it does not agree with the Descent at the Escorial, nor the Pietà at Brussels (No. 516), nor the new Roger at the Louvre. It is probably by some close follower of the Van Eycks (not Roger), as the types of the Madonna, the white-cowled women back of her, the man at right with the red hat seem to indicate. The figures on the reverse apparently confirm this. Assigned by some to the Master of Flémalle.

1888. * ——***The Crucifixion.*** The central panel of a triptych that has been much talked about and is of

interest in art history. The central figures are certainly profound and passionate in feeling. The St. John is particularly fine. The drawing is angular, the modelling hard, the figures attenuated in the hands and feet and cramped in the body of the Christ. The drapery is a little freer. The church at the back keeps its place well enough as a background but is too full of material. The colour is rich, varied, very handsome. The Gothic framing of the central figures, showing smaller scenes from the life of Christ, is, perhaps, a little confusing. Their bright spots of colour seem insufficiently subordinated to the central figures. Moreover, these small scenes seem done by a different hand from the one that did the larger figures. Perhaps Roger did only the larger figures, and his pupils or assistants put in the smaller groups, and then, again, perhaps it is all school work. It is not difficult to give a cock-sure opinion here, but then it might not be correct.

1889. * ——***Adam and Eve.*** This is the left wing of No. 1888. There are slight but graceful figures passing out of the gate of Paradise—the garden being shown at the back and the angel with the flaming sword at the top. The Gothic framing, with scenes from the Creation, repeats in a slighter way that of No. 1888 and is again apparently by pupils or assistants of Roger.

1891. * ——***The Last Judgment.*** This is the right wing of No. 1888. Again one sees the tragic passion of the Judgment, the sorrow of the Christ, the amazement of those below, the terror of the damned. There is a feeling, an intensity about it that is not seen in ordinary Last Judgments—a feeling that

belongs alone to Roger van der Weyden or, at least, is seen only in pictures ascribed to him. The Gothic framing with small figures surrounds the panel, as in No. 1889, and shows again a different hand from the one that did the central figures. On the reverse of these wings are figures in grisaille.

1886. ** ——*Crucifixion.* This is a small picture but is, perhaps, the most satisfactory Van der Weyden here. The feeling of it is intense. All the figures are in the depths of woe, even the less demonstrative John. The drapery of the figures is beautifully done, and the colour of the picture is superb. Notice the beautiful landscape at the back. At the bottom is the false monogram of Albrecht Dürer, with the date, 1513. Compare this picture with the large Descent (No. 1893) here to get an idea of Roger van der Weyden and his work. This No. 1886 belongs in the same class as the Pietà at Brussels (No. 516). By comparison with No. 1888 it makes the latter seem more certainly by the school rather than by the master himself.

1893. * ——*Deposition.* The catalogue puts it down as a copy by Coxcie after the picture at the Escorial, but there may be some doubt about this. The No. 1894, another copy, may be by Coxcie, but this one seems good enough for, say, a replica. There is no hesitation, timidity, or weakness about it. At any rate, in the absence of the Escorial original the student should study it as a Roger. It is a large and very important picture—in fact, too large for a man trained in the miniature manner of the Van Eycks. It lacks the decorative charm, the jewel-like quality of colour of his smaller works. Moreover, the large figures in their angu-

larity of line strike the eye more abruptly than the smaller figures. They have no grace of linear composition in an Italian sense, no rhythmic repetition, no fine plastic pattern. They are ponderous, oppressive, heavy. And this in spite of the passion, the pathos, the dramatic power. The picture (either here or at the Escorial) is a notable work, but, like many other attempts at doing something large, it perhaps falls short of that perfect achievement which comes to artists, oftentimes in their least pretentious essays.

1236. * **Zurbaran, Francisco de.** ***Vision of St. Peter.*** The angel is a charming piece of colour if rather weak in drawing. And what very good draperies! The vision opening at the left is more or less disturbing. Zurbaran was, perhaps, the best painter in the School of Seville, despite the wide reputation of his younger contemporary, Murillo.

1239. ——***St. Casilda.*** It is ill drawn and hard in modelling, but it has originality of conception and some further invention in the matter of colour. It is not a tame repetition of things Italian.

INDEX OF PICTURES BY NUMBERS

15. Angelico, Fra.
20. Basaiti.
45. Bassano, L.
50. Bellini, Giovanni.
57. Michelangelo Buonarroti.
69. Girolamo da Carpi.
111, 112 Correggio.
143. Francia, G.
240. Lotto.
242, 243 Luini.
248. Mantegna.
262. Moroni.
269. Palma Vecchio.
279, 280 Parmigianino.
287. Pontormo.
288, 289 Pordenone.
296–304 Raphael.
323. Romano, Giulio.
332–338 Sarto, Andrea del.
345. Piombo, S. del.
356. Tiepolo, D.
363, 364 Tiepolo, G. B.

379, 386, 388, 389, 390, 393–399 Tintoretto.

407–415, 417–422, 425–432, 434, 435, 437–440, 442–445, 448 Titian.

482, 483, 484, 486, 491, 492, 497, 498, 500, 501, 502 Veronese, P.

504. Leonardo da Vinci.
511. Volterra.
524, 525 Umbrian School.
610–618 Berruguete.
627, 629 Cano.
642, 645, 646, 648 Carreño de Miranda.
705–710 Gallegos.
806–812, 820, 822, 824, 825, 827 Greco, Il.
838–842, 855 Juanes, J. de.
888, 889 Mazo.
943, 946 Morales.
961–965, 972, 974, 975, 978, 979, 988, 993 Murillo.
1022–1025 Pacheco.
1031, 1033, 1037 Pantoja de la Cruz.
1062, 1065, 1069 Ribalta.
1078, 1101, 1115 Ribera.
1136, 1140, 1144 Coello, Sanchez.
1159. Tristan.
1166–1174, 1176–1211 Velasquez.
1214. Mazo.
1224. Velasquez.
1236, 1239 Zurbaran.
1298. Spanish School.
1317. Pereda y Salgado.
1361. Bles.
1430. Brueghel the Elder, Jan.
1461. Christus.
1473, 1474, 1475, 1477–1481, 1483, 1486–1489, 1493 Dyck, A. van.
1510. Eyck, H. van.
1511. Eyck, J. van.

1513–1514 Master of Flémalle.
1536–1537 Gossart.
1542. Hemessen.
1543–1550 Jordaens.
1557. Memling.
1559. Metsys.
1611–1617–1637–1638–1640–1642–1644–1645–1650–1658–1665–1667–1674–1677–1679–1685–1687–1693 Patinir.
1796. Teniers.
1858–1859 Veen, Van.
1886–1889–1891–1893 Weyden, R. van der.
1915–1920–1921–1930–1932–1933–1936 Flemish School.
2048–2053 Bosch.
2078. Dou.
2107–2108–2110–2111–2114 Moro
2131. Potter.
2132. Rembrandt.
2177–2180 Dürer.
2182. Holbein.
2219–2220 German School.
2254–2259 Claude Lorraine.

00
J5-1